

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 034 477

HE 001 199

TITLE The Extra-Curriculum. The Study of Education at Stanford. Report to the University.

INSTITUTION Stanford Univ., Calif.

REPORT NO Rep-6

PUB DATE Aug 69

NOTE 95p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.50 HC-\$4.85

DESCRIPTORS *Athletic Activities, Clubs, *Cocurricular Activities, *Higher Education, Intercollegiate Programs, Physical Education, School Newspapers, *School Publications, *Student Organizations, Student Unions

IDENTIFIERS *Stanford University

ABSTRACT

This report, the sixth in a series of ten, was prepared by the Steering Committee, the Study of Education at Stanford. The series, based on the concept that education should be a continuous process of discovery throughout life, sets forth recommendations for strengthening the academic enterprise at Stanford. To enhance the educational value of extracurricular activities, this report offers 24 recommendations in 3 major areas--cultural events, publications, and athletics. The proposed changes are designed to promote the personal growth (i.e. self-esteem, interpersonal relations, creativity) of student participants. Recommendations cover the responsibilities of a proposed faculty-staff-student Committee on the Extracurriculum; the establishment of 3 additional physical facilities for extracurricular activities; improvements in the Stanford Daily, supplements to the Daily, literary and political publications, course evaluations, and non-student publications; and the division of the athletic department into 2 separate departments, the Department of Athletics (inter-collegiate) and the Department of Physical Education. Further recommendations deal with orienting freshmen athletes, organizing the Department of Physical Education, and integrating the Department of Athletics with the University community. The report is available from: Study of Education at Stanford, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305. (DS)

ED034477

The Study of Education
at Stanford

Report to
the University

VI

The Extracurriculum

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 001 199

Contents

Preface	1
Letter of transmittal: Steering Committee	3
Summary of Recommendations	5
Report of the Topic Committee	13
Report on the Subcommittee of Athletics	37
Appendices	
1. ASSU Organizations, 1968-69	58
2. Directory of Voluntary Organizations	61
3. Regulation of Voluntary Organizations	64
4. Psychosocial Aspects of Athletics	66
5. Statistics on Athletic Participation	71
6. Organization Chart—Department of Physical Education and Athletics	75
7. Financial Statement—Department of Physical Education and Athletics	76
8. Summary of Student Athlete Questionnaire	80
9. Statement by Stanford Council of Athletes	82
10. Statistics and Attitudes of Recruited Pacific-8 Conference Athletes	84

Preface

This is one of a series of reports, which we submit to the University community for its consideration. The first of our reports, *The Study and Its Purposes*, stated the general premises on which our recommendations turn. The remainder of this series consists of the following:

- II. *Undergraduate Education*
- III. *University Residences and Campus Life*
- IV. *Undergraduate Admissions and Financial Aid*
- V. *Advising and Counseling*
- VI. *The Extracurriculum*
- VII. *Graduate Education*
- VIII. *Teaching, Research, and the Faculty*
- IX. *Study Abroad*
- X. *Government of the University*

Comments on these reports, and requests for copies, should be addressed in writing to Study of Education at Stanford, Room 2A, Building 1, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305.

August 1969

Steering Committee
The Study of Education at Stanford

Steering Committee
The Study of Education at Stanford

Herbert L. Packer, *Chairman*
Professor of Law and Vice Provost

Norton T. Batkin III
Undergraduate student in Philosophy

James F. Gibbons
Professor of Electrical Engineering

Albert H. Hastorf
Executive Head and Professor of Psychology

Joshua Lederberg
Executive Head and Professor of Genetics

Mark Mancall
Associate Professor of History

Michael M. Menke
A.B. Princeton 1963;
Graduate student in Physics

Anne G. Osborn
A.B. Stanford 1965
Graduate Student in Medicine

Leonard I. Schiff
Professor of Physics

Robert R. Hind
Staff Director, Study of Education at Stanford

Letter of transmittal

To: Members of Stanford University

From: Steering Committee, Study of Education at Stanford

In the introduction to our Report III, *University Residences and Campus Life*, we stated our conviction that the campus environment, especially those aspects of it that affect one's sense of community, have a considerable capacity for either increasing or diminishing the ability of students to educate themselves. This theme is again prominent in the following report of our Topic Committee on the Extracurriculum.

The charge presented to the Topic Committee was to study those aspects of the extracurriculum that appeared to be most critical to the educational process and to make recommendations that would improve the educational value of these activities. In carrying out this charge, the Topic Committee focused on four major aspects of the extracurriculum—student organizations, cultural events, campus publications, and athletics—and developed recommendations designed to enhance the contribution of these activities to the life of the University.

The SES Steering Committee is pleased to transmit this report to the University community and to endorse the general principles that are developed in it. We also wish to express our appreciation to the Topic Committee on the Extracurriculum for the valuable contribution they have made.

The membership of the Committee was:

Members of the Committee on the Extracurriculum

Marvin Chodorow, *Chairman, Professor of Applied Physics*

Barbara G. Dray, *Assistant to Dean of Students*

Sanford M. Dornbusch, *Professor of Sociology*

Sidney D. Drell, *Professor, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center*

Robert N. Funk, *SES staff member, Assistant Dean, School of Education*

Robert A. Helliwell, *Professor of Electrical Engineering*

Lucio P. Ruotolo, *Associate Professor of English*

Members of the Subcommittee on Publications

Sanford M. Dornbusch, *Chairman, Professor of Sociology*

Robert W. Beyers, *Director, News Service*

Peter J. Duignan, *Director of African Studies, Hoover Institution on War, Revolution and Peace*

Charles N. Fifer, *Associate Professor of English*

David L. Grey, *Assistant Professor of Communication*

James Patrick McMahon, *Undergraduate student in Communication*

Daniel Snell, *Undergraduate student in General Studies*

Michael Sweeney, *Undergraduate student in Economics*

Members of the Subcommittee on Athletics

Marvin Chodorow, *Chairman, Professor of Applied Physics*

Nathaniel R. Benchley, *Undergraduate student in French*

John Carl Gilmore, *Instructor, Physical Education*

Robert A. Helliwell, *Professor of Electrical Engineering*

Joseph R. Higgins, *Director, Wilbur Hall*

William C. McCammon, Jr., *Assistant Research Administrator, Controller's Office*

Frederick T. Melges, *Assistant Professor of Psychiatry*

David Eugene Nelson, *Undergraduate student in Political Science*

Lucio P. Ruotolo, *Associate Professor of English*

Summary of Recommendations

—

Cultural Events

Because of the positive values of many extracurricular activities for both the individual and the University, Stanford should increase its support of them in the following ways:

1. The Dean of Students should be given clear-cut responsibility for developing a creative, balanced, and interesting extracurricular program at Stanford. He should be assisted in this task by a student-faculty-staff Committee on the Extracurriculum. Its members should represent the broad range of extracurricular activity at Stanford—political, social, religious, recreational, artistic. The Dean of Students should serve as an *ex officio* member. This committee should be responsible for making recommendations to the Dean of Students on a number of significant matters, the most important being funding of, space for, and coordination of all extracurricular activity at Stanford.
2. The University should establish an annual budget of at least \$25,000 as a contingency fund for the extracurricular program. This budget should be administered by the Dean of Students, on the recommendations of the Committee on the Extracurriculum. This committee should also make recommendations for expanding the fund, as need warrants such expansion.
3. The Committee on the Extracurriculum should list and publicize the small funds now available in various offices and departments for special programs so that interested persons would know better where to find support.

4. The Committee on the Extracurriculum should investigate ways of assisting poorly financed and managed groups in improving their business/fiscal policies and practices so that, among other benefits, hard-to-find funds will not be wasted.

5. The Committee on the Extracurriculum should develop a list of resource personnel, faculty, and staff members who have expressed an interest in and are willing to devote some of their time to assisting groups in particular activities.

6. The Committee on the Extracurriculum should study and develop means to coordinate, but not to control, the many similar programs now being produced by many different groups. The kind of coordination we suggest can be accomplished in various ways, depending upon the nature of the activity. For instance, coordination for certain events, particularly the performing arts, could be provided by the Committee on Public Exercises and by the new Director of Public Events, a position proposed in SES Report III and endorsed by our Committee. The Committee on the Extracurriculum should continually evaluate attempts to coordinate and should encourage and assist in bringing about coordination where advisable.

7. The Committee on the Extracurriculum should develop ways of publicizing coordinating agencies (e.g., the Director of Public Events and the Committee on Public Exercises) and joint services provided for extracurricular activities.

8. Cooperation between organizations and academic departments or offices should be encouraged, particularly when they are involved in related work.

9. Additional bookkeeping and secretarial help should be provided for extracurricular organizations, both by increasing the ASSU staff and by encouraging offices and departments with close ties with certain organizations to provide whatever assistance they can. An additional staff member, an organizations secretary, should be added to the ASSU staff immediately. Additional staff members should be added as need is demonstrated.

10. Three additional physical facilities should be made available for extracurricular activities. The Committee on the Extracurriculum should look into the possibility of using facilities within existing structures as well as initiate the planning and fund-raising for structures to meet the following needs:

- a. A facility that would contain as many as 50 small, furnished offices. Spaces in the building should be assigned by the Dean of Students, on the recommendation of the Committee on the Extracurriculum.

b. A creative arts center, which might contain such facilities as a pottery workshop, a free studio, a jewelry design workshop, photography dark-rooms, film-making equipment, a theater-in-the-round. This facility should be designed to stimulate and provide an outlet for creativity.

c. The third should be an expanded social service clearinghouse patterned after the Phillips Brooks House at Harvard or Dwight Hall at Yale.* Such a facility would allow for the expansion of the Volunteer Services Center currently operating in Building 590 (adjacent to the Old Union) and would serve as an active center for those interested in social and community service activities.

11. The Dean of Students and the Committee on the Extracurriculum should consider additional ways of making the activities of voluntary organizations known to all members of the Stanford community.

Publications

12. *The Stanford Daily*. Changes in the organizational structure of the *Stanford Daily* should be made rapidly; financial changes should come more gradually, with the ideal of complete financial autonomy left for the future.

a. Beginning in 1969-70, the *Daily* publishing board should be set up as a completely separate entity—a legally independent corporation apart from student government and separate from the University.

b. The present \$28,000 subscription fee for the *Daily* should be continued but freed from all present strings.

c. A non-cancellable lease between the University and the *Daily* should be drawn up whereby the *Daily* would be given use of the Storke Publications Building and provided with free utilities in exchange for a token annual rental fee.

d. Starting in 1969-70, the *Daily* profits, aside from possible staff bonuses, should be retained by the *Daily* for an improvement fund. The *Daily* should also consider an immediate increase in advertising rates.

13. *Supplements to the Daily*. The University must have an additional publication medium to supplement the *Daily* during dead and finals weeks and other times when it is not publishing.

*A proposal made in SES Report II, page 33, and endorsed by our Committee.

- a. When important events occur during dead and finals weeks and between quarters, a new publication or a version of the *Campus Report* should be available for quick distribution to all students, staff, and faculty.
- b. When the *Daily* chooses not to publish material which the University considers of major importance, the University should purchase advertising space in the *Daily* and publish the additional material.
- c. The Academic Senate should initiate negotiations with the *Daily* for a weekly supplementary page of faculty and staff opinion, independently edited by faculty and staff members. These negotiations should include discussions of whether the Academic Senate should pay for this space.

14. *Literary and Political Publications.* The University should set up a permanent fund of \$3,000 to \$5,000 annually, within the extracurricular contingency fund, for supporting new creative publications.

- a. A member of the News Service or Publications Service should be assigned as a permanent source of advice on the financing, printing, and distributing of these publications.
- b. Publications should consider savings and distribution made possible by publishing as a paid supplement to the *Daily*.

15. *Course Evaluations.* The University should support processes by which courses and faculty are evaluated.

- a. We propose the creation of a Committee on Course Evaluations.* The majority of the committee should be students; faculty should be on the committee as resource personnel, to assist in making general policy and establishing standardized procedures.
- b. The University and the ASSU should each contribute one-half of a modest subsidy for research and publication of an annual "Scratch Sheet."

16. *Non-student Publications.* Although the University produces hundreds of publications, there appears to be a need for others or for some existing ones to receive wider distribution. Stanford's alumni publications are excellent, but internal communications must be improved.

- a. The Provost should establish a representative committee to investigate thoroughly, report on, and make recommendations concerning the multiplicity of departmental and institutional publications.

*Since this recommendation was written, a committee has been established by the Provost, headed by Professor Bradley Efron, to consider a course evaluation.

b. The new *Campus Report* should have an enlarged area of coverage and a greater number of pages. It should be distributed to students as well as to faculty and staff members.*

c. *Stanford Today*, *Stanford Observer*, and *Alumni Almanac* should also be mailed to faculty and staff at their homes.

Athletics

17. The present Department of Physical Education and Athletics should be divided into two separate departments: a Department of Physical Education and a Department of Athletics.

a. Following such a separation, the Department of Athletics should be responsible only for the intercollegiate program; the Department of Physical Education should be responsible for the instructional program, the intramural sports program, club sports, and other University recreational needs.

b. The heads of both departments should be responsible to an official in the Provost's office, an arrangement similar to the present one for women's physical education.

Physical education, intramural, and recreational programs

18. Consideration should be given to combining the men's and women's departments of physical education into one Department of Physical Education, with a single department head. A multi-recreation program should be the primary responsibility of this Department.

19. *Implementation Committee.* A committee should be constituted immediately and charged with the responsibility of studying a merger of the men's and women's physical education departments, working out all necessary arrangements for joint facility use and joint appointments for teaching and coaching. The committee should include representatives from the men's and women's physical education departments, the Athletics Department, the SES Subcommittee on Athletics, and the Provost's office.

*Since May 1969, *Campus Report* has routinely been distributed to student living groups and campus box locations.

a. The committee should further be charged with visiting comparable institutions within the Pacific-8 Conference to ascertain ways in which those universities have faced this problem.

b. Final recommendations and arguments for implementation should be worked out between the departments through the Provost's office.

20. *Recreation Committee.* A student-faculty physical education committee should be appointed to guide the character of recreational portions of the program, within the available finances. The committee should include students, faculty, staff, and members of the physical education departments. One member of the Physical Education Department who is concerned with intramural sports should be an *ex officio* member.

Intercollegiate athletic program

21. Current research* on the potential value of athletic activity as it contributes to personal growth and community feeling should be continued with the aim of developing guidelines for subsequent policy decisions. Support should be provided for such research, and the results of such studies should be made public and widely disseminated.

22. The operation of the Department of Athletics should become integrated more closely with the Stanford community. Specifically:

a. *Coach Selection Committee.* A special selection committee for coaches should be formed. This might include the Director of Athletics, a coach (from another sport) selected by the entire coaching staff, two faculty members appointed by the President from a slate nominated by the Academic Senate, and two student athletes from the sport for which a coach is being selected, elected by their teammates.

Coaches should be selected who are aware of and sensitive to the problems of student athletes. They should be able to work with young men of above average intelligence and sensitivity, contributing to both their intellectual and emotional maturation. By taking part in the academic community as much as possible, they should serve as models for self-enhancement and broadening perspectives. Special attention should be given to the selection of freshmen coaches, since these men often serve as key counselors for student athletes. In addition, with the increasing number of black athletes and their problems, there should be a concerted effort to hire black coaches with personal stature and sensitivity to the Stanford environment.

*Joint effort by Dr. Frederick T. Melges of the Department of Psychiatry and Dr. John Maurer of Cowell Student Health Center.

b. Review of Schedules. The above committee and, especially, the elected team members, should review each year the games scheduled for future seasons. This review would be aimed at influencing the extent of the schedule and level of competition in line with the teams' preferences. If the level of competition in the Pacific-8 Conference interferes with the academic and athletic values of Stanford, the University should consider changing its relationship to this league, perhaps taking active measures to form a conference similar to that of the Ivy League.

c. Recruitment Policy. For the most part, recruitment policies should be aimed at getting top level students who are also athletes. This policy would mean finding student athletes well above minimum standards. It would ensure getting students who could participate in athletics and still perform well academically. The educational opportunities at Stanford should be the primary appeal.

d. Student Assistants. Student athletes at Stanford should be employed to educate prospective candidates about their anticipated roles as a student and athlete. In these counseling activities, we recommend using students who have been successful both as athletes and as members of the University community through academic performance, other extracurricular activities, etc. Care must be taken in choosing such students; a mechanism involving the Office of the Dean of Students would be desirable.

e. Admission Standards. Admissions standards should be maintained at no less than present levels. Borderline cases should be judged closely on subjective issues such as motivation, open-mindedness, and approach to academic and intellectual activities. This judging should be done by persons not connected with the Department of Athletics, yet by those who are not hostile to athletics. Suitably qualified student athletes might take a part in the selection process of marginal cases.

f. Coach-faculty Integration. Attempts should continue to integrate coaches into the University community. Luncheon meetings with faculty or staff should be held with the aim of keeping coaches close to academic life and the faculty acquainted with the problems of the Athletic Department. Coaches should talk to students and student leaders who are not athletes.

g. Athlete-coach Panel. A panel of student athletes should be formed to discuss with coaches some of the problems their fellow athletes face in integration into the University. New coaches should be particularly encouraged to participate in these meetings. The potential influence that a coach has on students is profound; the nature of this influence should be to integrate the student more fully into University life and not to create unnecessary role conflicts.

23. The student athletes' view of the University should be broadened by the following measures:

a. *Welcoming Letter.* A letter to all students who return "Letters of Intent" to Stanford would be helpful in welcoming the student athlete. It should point out the educational opportunities of his coming four years, stressing that he will be both a student and an athlete. This letter could be written and signed by the Council of Athletes or the special committee of student athletes.

b. *Freshman Athlete Housing.* Athletes should be housed among all freshman residences including coed houses. Residence staff and sponsors must be sensitive and open to the adjustment problems facing a highly publicized 18-year-old with an athletic background. Moving freshman football one week forward was a constructive step, because the athlete's first encounters should be with those in his residence. It is important for the freshman coaches to recognize their athletes' need to integrate with their dormmates and classmates and to take advantage of as many broadening educational experiences as possible.

c. *Student Athlete Advising.* Since recruited freshman athletes come to Stanford under special circumstances and face adjustment problems different from those of the average student, it is important that their academic advisers be carefully selected. Advisers should be chosen for a comprehension of the athlete's special problem; they should, of course, be free of anti-athletic bias. It is important that all athletes not be assigned to a few advisers. It may be that former athletes, either staff members or graduate students with appropriate academic interests, could serve in this capacity.

24. *Athlete Panel Discussion.* Early in the fall quarter, it would be helpful to the freshman athlete to witness and take part in a panel discussion dealing with the role of the athlete in the University. This meeting should be closed. The panel should consist of athletes who are acquainted with the problems of an athlete, can verbalize them well, and have been successful in overcoming these problems. The panel members should have the legitimacy of success in athletics, but the membership should have a broad enough perspective to look critically at athletic participation. The evening should be used to spell out the problems and criticisms athletes face, some ways to solve these problems, and some constructive suggestions as to how the freshmen might get more out of their educational experience. Invitations should go to all freshman athletes and, again, might come from the Council of Athletes. The Council of Athletes might organize this discussion, but it should be assisted by someone experienced in advising and residence work.

Introduction

Report
of the
Topic Committee

The Committee on the Extracurriculum was originally charged with looking into all extracurricular activity at Stanford. The members initially divided their objectives into three areas: 1) publications, 2) athletics, and 3) cultural activities (a general term for those activities not included in one of the other two areas), each with its own subcommittee. While our comments and recommendations on cultural activities are not supported by substantial research and were not subject to as close scrutiny as the other two portions of our report, we nevertheless think they represent necessary and important reforms and should be carefully considered.

The two areas of activity we have considered most extensively—publications and athletics—probably have a greater impact on the University community than do many other extracurricular activities because, rather than affecting only subgroups, these two involve the University as a whole. However, the close attention given them does not imply that other activities are less important in making significant contributions to the University community. All extracurricular activities provide students, as well as faculty, staff, and their families, with opportunities for personalized, individual, often unstructured activity in an environment that too often is impersonal and coldly competitive. Activities such as these can contribute significantly to a sense of community at Stanford.

In several sections of our report, we have distinguished between active (i.e., participant) and passive (i.e., spectator) involvement in extracurricular

activity. The majority of our recommendations affect the quality of active involvement, although we also discuss passive involvement, particularly in the comments about publications and their effects upon other members of the community. We have tried to make recommendations that will improve the quality of experience of the participant, believing that this improvement will be perceived and appreciated by the non-participant.

The report of the Subcommittee on Athletics is extensive. Because it deals with departmental, budgetary, and organizational questions that have little relevance to other forms of extracurricular activity, it is presented separately. However, the relationships and values of most extracurricular activities to their participants is similar to those of the athletic programs. In particular, many detailed comments made in Appendix 4, "Psychosocial Aspects of Athletics," apply equally to participation in other kinds of extracurricular activity. (The one feature usually absent in these other activities is the competitive one.) For example, the following statements, which are made in relation to athletic and sports participation, could be made with equal validity about other extracurricular activities:

Three factors, among others, appear especially relevant to emotional development: 1) the enhancement of interpersonal relationships, 2) getting a firm view of self, and 3) the commitment, modification, and realization of personal goals. . . .

This feeling of competence and efficacy—that is, the capacity to make events happen—is fundamental to self-esteem and identity. The more explicit the criteria for judging outcomes are, the greater are the chances for making precise self-evaluations of performance. . . .

. . . general factors of interpersonal relations, the self-image, and goal-directed behavior. Let us keep in mind that emotional development implies neither stoicism nor histrionics, but rather the capacity to become deeply involved and committed to goals shared with others, and to use feelings in the service of these pursuits instead of being controlled by angers, anxieties, and prejudices. . . .

One of the great rewards to be found in sports in a society becoming increasingly depersonalized and employed in routine jobs is the opportunity to preserve one's individuality and to find one little corner of personal achievement.

We have not attempted an extensive discussion of these particular values in the first sections of our report.

There is one characteristic of the athletic program on which we have commented adversely, which is even more applicable to cultural activity—the lack of organization and staff with principal responsibility for promoting and enriching these activities. Our criticism of the athletic program is that the internal needs of the University, as contrasted with intercollegiate activity, are not being promoted adequately, because of the complexities of the Athletic Department, which is responsible for both. But even this kind of subsidiary responsibility is not available for the cultural activities of the University. Despite the absence of substantial statistics to support our arguments, we can make essentially the same recommendation as for the athletic program: that there should be a person or persons appointed by the University whose principal responsibility would be the promotion and enhancement of the range of extracurricular activity, and that there should be a committee representing the various elements of the University—students, faculty, staff—formed of people with an appropriate range of interests, to assist and advise these officers on fostering and enriching programs of quality. Any such staff and committee should be given control over space and budget, both of which should be increased as the financial situation of the University permits. Specific recommendations are made in the context of the following reports.

Cultural Events & Publications

Report
of the
Topic Committee

Cultural Events

It should come as a surprise to no one that the meaning of the term "extra-curriculum" has changed significantly in recent years. It no longer pertains to athletic, social, and recreational activities alone. Recently, there has been a development of interest among students in activities, which might be called "extensions of the classroom," that give students the opportunity to apply classroom knowledge to specific social, economic, religious, and political problems existing around them—often as close as the communities immediately surrounding the campus.

The increasing interest of students in these problems has resulted in a wide variety of new political/social/religious organizations and activities. Moreover, new trends in the arts (particularly an expansion of creative possibilities and a closer linking of the arts, especially drama and film, with socio-political issues) have increased further the seriousness of many so-called extra-curricular activities. The campus has become a locus of activism, which takes many forms. For example, Stanford students have become more interested in such activities as tutoring minority students, doing legal aid work in local communities, working with the blind and handicapped, involving themselves in local political issues, and generally directing themselves outward—and often off campus—in their extracurricular pursuits. One result of this direction is an increasing interest among students in such activities as Teachers Corps, Peace

Corps, VISTA, Urban Coalition, and the Involvement Corps, all of which give students the opportunity to perform worthwhile service both for others and for themselves. Many students today look forward to careers of social utility and intellectual excitement, relegating financial security to a secondary position. Moreover, some students are interested in coordinating field work and research with academic programs; in this way, they get first-hand experience in working with the problems to which many, after graduation, will be looking for solutions on a full-time basis.

Recent years have also brought about the development of non-credit and in-residence seminars on subjects of interest to particular groups of students. Many of these are centered on controversial, contemporary subjects offering clear evidence of the importance of a new humanism in the thinking of students today.

There is, moreover, a continuing student enthusiasm for the arts, which is displayed in the organization of new projects, such as the Pottery Studio, the Photography Club, and The Company. Whether the number of students interested in such projects is increasing or whether they are presenting their needs more persuasively and articulately is hard to tell; in either case, the fact remains that interest is strong in support of extracurricular activities that are artistic and creative in nature.

The activities we have dealt with in this report cover a wide range of interest and take a number of organizational forms. We discuss mainly ASSU and voluntary organizations, but there are a large number of other organizations, most of which are departmentally linked, residually oriented, and off-campus, in which students are active but which are not represented in either of the two categories mentioned.¹

In addition to these largely student-initiated organizations, there are a number of groups organized by non-student members of the community (e.g., Faculty Women's Club, Cap and Gown), which welcome student participation in many of their activities. The Stanford community does not seem wanting in organizations to meet almost every interest and talent.

¹ ASSU organizations, boards, and commissions are defined in the ASSU Constitution, are allotted annual budgets by LASSU, and are limited to student membership almost without exception. (A list of current ASSU organizations can be found in Appendix 1.) Voluntary organizations are those which are not "institutionalized" and often *ad hoc*, which have no budgeted funds and must, therefore, ask for funds wherever they are available, and which, in membership, are open to and limited to members of the Stanford community, *i.e.*, students, faculty, staff, and their immediate families. *Ad hoc* groups must register as voluntary organizations if they wish to use the Stanford name, University facilities, or advocate publicly a position on a public issue. (A list of voluntary organizations registered as of February 5, 1969, and the regulations regarding voluntary organizations can be found in Appendices 2 and 3, respectively.)

We see two major trends in extracurricular activity at Stanford. The first is the increase in number of students now interested in activities that are no longer "extra"-curricular, activities that relate directly to classroom work and to current issues. The second is the increase in number of students participating in widely diversified new organizations.²

One explanation for this new activism is the decline of the "ivory tower" image of the University. Many students want more from their time outside the classroom than recreation; they want to increase their knowledge of the problems plaguing the world and to deal effectively with some of them. The desire of today's students to study relevant subjects is a good example of this trend. Students are keenly aware of contemporary problems and want to apply classroom studies to solutions for them. Many find, in extracurricular activity, a kind of immediate applicability of themselves and their studies to such problems, one answer to the cry for relevance. Others find in this work a creative release and new awareness. Still others find a career training ground, an opportunity to apply themselves to different problems and to acquire new skills.

Because of the many positive values in extracurricular activity, we must wholeheartedly support the enthusiasm and commitment of all members of the Stanford community who are involved in them. We offer the following recommendations for ways in which the University might better support many of these activities.

Administrative Responsibility

At present, no officer of the University has as a major responsibility the development of a widely diversified, comprehensive, and balanced extracurricular program. It now falls to the Dean of Students to assume significant

²It is impossible to document the exact number of persons participating in each organization. The University no longer requires that membership lists or figures be submitted, so it is hard to estimate how substantial the increase in student activity has been. But anyone who compares student activities 4 years ago with those now will see that a significantly larger number of students are taking part in the activities of a greater number of organizations. As a general basis of comparison, one might note that in 1965 there were 30 ASSU organizations and from 9 to 32 voluntary organizations (depending upon the date the count was taken), as compared to 33 ASSU organizations and 85 voluntary organizations in winter quarter of 1969. Moreover, these figures do not reflect the number of residence, departmental, and off-campus organizations, which are not required to register as voluntary organizations but which have significant numbers of Stanford students among their active members.

responsibility for the non-academic lives of students, but he is not seen by all constituencies of this community as what he should be: an assessor of that which exists, a creator of that which should exist but does not, and a consistent supporter—in terms of personnel, funds, and space—of varying extracurricular programs of quality. The complex nature of extracurricular activity at Stanford—one result of its having grown without clear and consistent direction—as well as the Dean's limited funds and staff, have worked against his assuming a more creative role in the area of the extracurriculum.

We recommend, therefore, that the Dean of Students be given clearcut responsibility for developing a creative, balanced, and interesting extracurricular program at Stanford. In this effort, he should be assisted by a student-faculty-staff Committee on the Extracurriculum. Its members should represent the broad range of extracurricular activity at Stanford—political, social, religious, recreational, artistic. The Dean of Students should be an *ex officio* member. The committee should be vested with responsibility for making recommendations to the Dean of Students on a number of significant matters, the most important being funding of, space for, and coordination of all extracurricular activity at Stanford. On the following pages the responsibilities of this committee are outlined more specifically.

Within the definition of this recommendation, the membership of the Committee on the Extracurriculum is likely to be large and to represent many differing viewpoints. Its charge, at least initially, would not include responsibilities that are already dealt with effectively elsewhere. Rather, its most beneficial contribution to the University would be provided by a close working relationship with established groups. For example, since the Director of Public Events and the Committee on Public Exercises already assume a large degree of responsibility in several areas of the new committee's concern, particularly in the performing arts, it is important that both continue to assume that responsibility and that both be well represented on the new committee. We envision an expansion of the roles of the Director of Public Events and the Committee on Public Exercises in the area of the performing arts. On the other hand, since policies on use of University facilities are critical to the development of a balanced extracurricular program, we anticipate a shared responsibility between the Committee on Public Exercises and the Committee on the Extracurriculum, for the development of those policies.

Another instance of the need for significant representation on the Committee on the Extracurriculum is in the area of recreation. Since one of the charges of the committee should be the development and equitable use of

recreational facilities, the Departments of Athletics and Women's Physical Education, or their successor organizations, should be represented. Representation should also be given to such organizations as the Tresidder Union Board and the International Center, because of their active involvement in program planning of various kinds. Determination of constituencies and representation on the Committee on the Extracurriculum should be decided by the Dean of Students, in consultation with the President of the University, the Academic Senate, and the Associated Students of Stanford University (ASSU). Each of the defined constituencies will then select a representative or representatives who, in turn, will be approved by the appropriate individual or body.

Financial Requirements

The substantial increase in extracurricular activities at Stanford, which we described earlier, has not been matched by a corresponding increase in funds. The budget of ASSU still supports ASSU activities, boards, and commissions and as many of the voluntary organizations as it can, though its Contingency Fund steadily decreases.

Each quarter the ASSU receives funds from the University General Fund, representing a *per capita* figure (\$3.00 per student per quarter³), based on the total number of students registered by the second week of each quarter. Rising registration figures have caused a small increase in the annual allocation to ASSU, but this increase has not kept pace with the rapidly increasing number of organizations, the expanded membership of many organizations, and more extensive program plans.

Funds allocated to ASSU in the spring for the following year are first distributed among ASSU organizations, whose numbers, membership figures, and program plans increase continually. Remaining unbudgeted funds are then placed in the ASSU Contingency Fund, which is used for voluntary organizations, new programs, and unexpected needs of previously budgeted organizations. Actually ASSU funds available for such programs have decreased at roughly the same rate as the needs of budgeted organizations have increased. Therefore, turning to ASSU for financial assistance is hardly a viable alternative for non-ASSU organizations.

³The ASSU By-Laws require that \$.85 out of each \$3.00 be allotted for the *Daily*.

Few additional sources of funds, over and above the ASSU Contingency Fund, are available for *ad hoc* programs. A few departments and committees in the University, the Committee on Public Exercises and Dean of Students office in particular, have small funds, often with restrictions placed on them by donors, for projects of quality, especially those demonstrating student initiative. Although helpful, these funds hardly begin to meet the needs of many organizations, particularly those with ambitious and expensive programs. Moreover, the existence of such funds is not widely known.

Since sources of non-ASSU funds are few, meager, and difficult to find, fund-raising becomes a major problem for most groups. In recent years, a number of potentially valuable programs were either never attempted, or were so substantially cut that they were made insignificant, because sufficient funds could not be found. Another important problem is that many groups, particularly creative and artistic ones, may not have members who are adept at fund-raising and dealing with business matters. These groups are often discouraged when they are given what they feel is a "run-around" while in search of money. Current financial circumstances therefore work against such groups and seem to favor those that have members who are adept in business and financial matters. Both sorts of groups can make valuable offerings to the community, but the current system gives the advantage to one over the other.

We are not speaking here of enormous amounts of money. The needs of many organizations could be satisfied with subsidies as small as \$50 to \$100, but even that amount is difficult to find, given the limited availability of unrestricted funds and the stipulations on those that are restricted. We recommend, therefore, that the University assume greater responsibility for funding the quality projects of as many organizations as possible. If the University is to finance properly a good extracurricular program, a budget of at least \$25,000 may be required, according to current estimates of need. Such an amount, however, would not begin to be adequate to fund entirely major projects (e.g., Century 21, the Stanford Population and Environment Forum) but would serve as a contingency fund, available to all extracurricular groups by application.

The budget could be administered in various ways, but the best alternative seems to us to be to add this amount to the activity funds of the Dean of Students. The Committee on the Extracurriculum would be charged with reviewing and recommending action on each application for funds or setting up guidelines for expenditures, which would then be followed by the Dean of Students.

Among its functions, the committee should also have responsibility for recommending that more than \$25,000 be made available in the extracurriculum fund, if sufficient need is demonstrated. The committee would also be charged with looking into ways of obtaining sufficient funding for the extracurricular program; its investigations on this subject might include a review of gift solicitation opportunities, an increase or reallocation of student fees, and any number of additional possibilities.

We want to make it clear that we are not suggesting that the University fund every group and program, but that allocations be based on the quality of purpose of the group or program and its potential, positive contribution to the community. It seems to us that making available these unrestricted funds would allow for creative and spontaneous programs, which could be of higher quality than those currently offered.

Availability of Small Funds. At the present time, there are small funds available in various offices and departments for special programs.

The Committee on the Extracurriculum should initiate a study to determine 1) what funds are available, 2) the requirements of each funding agency, and 3) whether some or all of these funds could and should be consolidated. The results of such a study should then be used to coordinate the allocation and possible consolidation of those funds and to publicize their existence to interested parties (with the approval of the offices and departments in question).

As another aspect of its task, the Committee on the Extracurriculum should investigate ways to assist poorly financed and managed groups in improving their business/fiscal policies and practices so that, among other benefits, hard-to-find funds will not be wasted. Still another task might be the creation of a list of resource personnel, faculty and staff members who have expressed an interest in and are willing to devote some of their free time and to share their expertise in assisting groups in particular activities.

Need for Coordination

At present, the activities of campus organizations seem so extensive and diverse as to defy coordination. In addition to the many ASSU and voluntary organizations involved in program planning, activity centers, such as the

I Center, Tresidder Union, and the residences, plan and present their own programs. In fact, it appears to many that the extracurriculum at Stanford often replaces quality with quantity, offering so much that it gluts the appetites of those it is trying to attract and to benefit. Many students currently involved in program-planning organizations strongly urge that an attempt be made to coordinate, but not to control, the many similar programs. In this way, we might avoid both wasting limited resources and flooding the campus with many mediocre programs rather than providing fewer exceptional ones. We strongly recommend such coordination.

We want to emphasize that we are not proposing the creation of new administrative posts, nor are we suggesting that any administrator extend his control over existing groups. Instead, we suggest that groups already involved in planning particular kinds of programs would benefit from contact with one another and from the assistance of experienced administrators. One of the first tasks of the newly created Committee on the Extracurriculum must be a thorough study of how the activities of campus groups might be better coordinated—to the detriment of none and the good of all.

The kind of coordination we suggest could be provided for certain types of activities, particularly the performing arts, by the new Director of Public Events, a position proposed in SES Report III, *University Residences and Campus Life*. He should work with a variety of committees organized by interest (e.g., film, drama, music); the members of each committee would be persons involved with the planning and implementing of programs of the kind with which the particular committee would be dealing. For example, a committee on film series might include representatives from each of the following: Tresidder Film Series, I Center, Keio Committee, University Travel Series, residence film groups (e.g., Stern Hall), Freshman Film Series, and the several other groups interested in presenting films on campus. Although the purposes of each of the series may differ, it makes some sense for each of the groups to know the plans of the other so that each might take advantage of the opportunity to schedule the same film on successive dates, thus saving money, or might avoid duplication of a particular film. Some of the one-upsmanship of showing the film before the competition might be avoided, and better series might be produced if some efforts were made to coordinate, and even consolidate some of the current efforts.

The Director of Public Events could, in this case, serve as a valuable resource to film series planning groups. He should know a great deal about cinematic arts and should, therefore, be able to advise students about which

films are available, which would serve a certain purpose, and which film agencies they might turn to. He should also have the financial resources to assist floundering programs.

Film series represent only one example of the kind of similar programs now planned by several different groups. Coordination of political programs by the ASSU Political Union should be continued and made more active than it is now. Coordination of community service and volunteer projects has already begun at the Volunteer Services Center, but additional money and space are needed to make this coordination more effective. Although some types of programs might not benefit from coordination, others would surely profit.

One of the functions of the Committee on the Extracurriculum, then, would be to review continually the progress of various attempts to coordinate, to make new recommendations, and to assist in bringing about that coordination where advisable. This committee should also develop ways of publicizing the coordinating agencies (e.g., the Committee on Public Exercises and Director of Public Events) and joint services provided for extracurricular activities.

Another kind of coordination is cooperation between organizations, academic departments, and offices involved with related work. Cooperation of this kind should be encouraged, so that students and other members of this community could benefit more fully from the range of talent and facilities at Stanford. Given the shortage of physical facilities, it becomes necessary for some groups to request the support of the academic departments that have the necessary room and equipment. For example, The Company and Ram's Head have enlisted the cooperation of the Speech and Drama Department in order to use their stage facilities.

It would also be useful if departments could provide bookkeeping and secretarial assistance to the organizations with whom they have close ties. Because this assistance would be limited by the financial and personnel capacities of willing departments, we also recommend that the staff of the ASSU office be increased to provide secretarial services to organizations that bank with the Students' Organizations Fund. One staff member, an organizations secretary, who might serve as secretary of the Committee on the Extracurriculum, should be added to the ASSU staff immediately. Further additions to the ASSU staff should be considered as need is demonstrated.

Need for Facilities

The University sorely needs space for many different activities. We do not intend to argue for providing facilities for extracurricular activities at the expense of academic needs, but we do think it important to state that facilities now provided for such activities are inadequate and should be expanded and improved as space funds can be found.

We would like to recommend, therefore, that three different kinds of facilities be made available as soon as possible for extracurricular use by members of the Stanford community. Since the building of these three facilities will require time, planning, and a substantial amount of money, and since the need for them is great—in some cases urgent—we recommend that one of the first tasks of the Committee on the Extracurriculum should be to look into the possibility of using existing buildings for some of these requirements. The committee should do what it can to urge immediate conversion of those facilities that lend themselves to such uses while other agencies begin the planning and fund-raising for new facilities. It should also explore the possibility of providing some of the needed space in the residences and other buildings now being planned.

When we speak of space we refer to two basic kinds of space. The first is simply office space, to keep the records of the group, to have a telephone, and to provide a headquarters for activities. The second is project space, which might be a photography darkroom, a pottery workshop, or an art studio.

At present, the only space that even partly satisfies the first need is in the ASSU Office,⁴ although scattered offices can be found in the Clubhouse, the I Center, and a few residences and departments. At least 40 ASSU organizations try to share this space, in addition to at least 85 voluntary organizations, which, almost without exception, require some facilities for operation. This number does not take into account the smaller departmental and residential organizations not required to register, nor does it include such groups as the ASSU Pre-Registration Commission, which are forced to operate out of someone's room either on or off campus, because they cannot be accommodated within the present facilities.

⁴The ASSU Office contains 5 offices, 14 desks, and a loft.

Although membership in many extracurricular activities seems to be continually increasing, membership in many organizations may still be limited by the inadequate facilities available to them. For example, if there were an attractive place for students to design jewelry, we might see an increase in the number of persons interested in that craft. We might find artistic, political, religious, and social service organizations vying with athletic organizations for members, if facilities were available equally to both.

One building should contain a large number (perhaps 50) of relatively small offices, each equipped with desk, chairs, and telephone, which might be used by ASSU and voluntary organizations as equitably as possible. The operation of the building could be the responsibility of either the Dean of Students or the ASSU. We recommend that the Dean of Students administer it, under the direction of the Committee on the Extracurriculum. Since voluntary organizations draw more and more members from faculty, staff, and their families, the Dean of Students should look to this community committee to advise him on allocation of space within such a building. The building should maintain no program of its own but should simply provide space to needy organizations.

The second facility, which we recommend, could be called a creative arts center and might contain a pottery workshop; free studios for painting, drawing, and sculpting; a jewelry-designing workshop; photography dark-rooms; film-making equipment; music practice rooms; perhaps even a theater-in-the-round. This building should not duplicate facilities available elsewhere; instead, it should provide the equipment necessary for the creative projects that now lack facilities. Ideally, this building would stimulate creativity among members of the Stanford community and would attract those who have something to offer in a particular creative field. For instance, if a well-known artist were in the area, he might be invited to visit a free studio for an hour or two, to talk with and instruct those who happened to be there. We feel that such a free-flowing, creative center would make a significant contribution to the Stanford community.

A third facility, which would offer much to the Stanford and surrounding communities, would be a social service clearinghouse patterned after the Phillips Brooks House at Harvard or Dwight Hall at Yale.⁵ Such a building would allow for the expansion of the Volunteer Services Center, which is

⁵Cf., SES Report II, *Undergraduate Education*, Recommendation 15, page 33.

currently operating in building 590 (adjacent to the Old Union), and could serve as an active center for those on the Stanford campus who are interested in social and community service activities. In addition to working with faculty and students in finding field work opportunities, negotiating with field agencies, and counseling students about possible projects, such a clearinghouse could serve as the campus headquarters for national and international agencies. It might also sponsor informational programs and seminars on social, racial, and poverty problems, as well as serving as an aid in orienting volunteers for local projects. We therefore endorse the SES Steering Committee's recommendation and feel that it would support the development of important extracurricular activities on campus and provide a vehicle for improved service to the surrounding communities.

The current location of the Volunteer Services Center provides a good example of the use of existing facilities rather than building new ones. Although we realize fully the high priority of space close to the academic center of the campus, we also think that all of Building 590 might eventually be used by an expanded Volunteer Services Center and community service organizations as well as by faculty and students interested in developing and taking part in academically sound field study and research programs.

Community Involvement

The Committee recommends that the Dean of Students and the Committee on the Extracurriculum consider ways to make the activities of voluntary organizations on campus known to all members of the Stanford community. Many members of the faculty and staff and their families feel that voluntary organizations are only open to students and that their participation would not be welcomed. They are mistaken. These are community organizations, and membership is open to students, faculty, staff, and their families. If this fact were better known, the activities of these organizations might be significantly improved by broader participation. Ways should be found to encourage Stanford community involvement in voluntary organizations. The *Stanford Daily*, *Campus Report*, and *Stanford Observer* might serve to publicize these opportunities.

Publications

The *Stanford Daily*

The *Stanford Daily* occupies an important place in the entire Stanford community. It has a monopoly position as the only daily vehicle for news and comment. Controlled by students, its audience includes faculty and staff, as well as students. Therefore, all segments of the Stanford community benefit when the *Daily* adequately performs its functions. It is unfortunate that the quality of the *Daily* varies dramatically from year to year and from editor to editor. But this price must be paid if the *Daily* is to continue as an important extracurricular activity for many students. Our recommendations seek to improve the structure and functioning of the *Daily* without substantially changing its character.

Total independence—editorial and financial—is ultimately desirable for the *Stanford Daily*. In the ideal, the *Daily* should be free from any possible control by University administration or student government. At the same time, the counterpart of this independence should be a strong sense of journalistic responsibility and maturity. The committee has found it possible to suggest organizational means for increasing and protecting the independence of the *Daily*. Unfortunately, there exist no such means for insuring journalistic responsibility or guarding against special and sometimes narrow commitments of a particular editor or editorial board. One can rely only on the self-restraint and tolerance of the editorial management.

There is no need to belabor the need for independence; it is basic to all our philosophical concerns about a free press and the need to separate press and government. There must be freedom for a fully open and responsible dialogue to take place within any society or community.⁶ The present structure of the *Daily*, with a \$28,000 subsidy from student government or from the University (the source is a matter of dispute), does not provide a climate of independence. This money, roughly 20 percent of the *Daily*'s total annual revenue, enables the paper to break even.

Whether there is, in fact, pressure on the *Daily* from the ASSU is not the issue. There have been some threats of pressure in recent years. And there is

⁶“Wherever possible the student newspaper should be an independent corporation financially and legally separate from the university.” Joint statement on rights and freedoms of students issued July 1967, by a drafting committee from the American Association of University Professors, the Association of American Colleges, and U.S. National Student Association, the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators, and the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors.

the potential for pressure, which makes the problem of future control very real. The *Daily* should be produced by students as an open channel of communication serving the entire University community. There should be no control of editorial content through control of financial resources.

It is the committee's conclusion that the present financial and political structure of the *Daily* is unhealthy and should begin to be changed now, before any major conflict of interest or other crisis arises. Organizational changes should be made rapidly; financial changes should come more gradually, with the ideal of complete financial autonomy left for the future.

In considering alternative structures for the *Daily*, we have reviewed the policies and procedures of other collegiate newspapers, being particularly sensitive to the need for protection of the *Daily's* editorial freedom. The present financial subsidy and organization permit constant threats to the *Daily's* autonomy without providing assistance in raising the standard of operations. While our recommendations do not fit any committee member's utopian formulation, we unanimously support them as representing an appropriate choice among feasible alternatives.

For the immediate future, the committee proposes the following three recommendations.

1. While the new *Daily* publishing board under ASSU is an improvement over earlier ones, any future board should not be responsible to the student government. Thus, starting in 1969-70, we recommend that the *Daily* publishing board should be set up as a completely separate entity, a legally independent corporation apart from student government and separate from the University. This corporation (perhaps called the *Stanford Daily Corporation*) would be a self-contained business in the spirit of well-established student papers at such universities as Harvard and Yale. It would have libel insurance and a financial reserve to permit the hiring of needed legal counsel for the corporation.

Instead of the present ASSU Board membership (consisting of the editor, business manager, ASSU student financial manager, two students appointed by the legislature, and two employees of the University who are not registered students), the new independent board should consist of: the editor, managing editor, business manager, a former editor (who is still a Stanford student), and three non-students chosen from among University faculty, staff, and alumni. At least one of these three should be experienced in publications and, at least one, skilled in business management. Initially, those board members who are not on the *Daily* staff would be selected by the outgoing

ASSU Board; thereafter the new board would elect its own non-staff members at staggered intervals in order to provide needed continuity on the board. Details on such matters and others would be written into the incorporating charter of the *Stanford Daily* Corporation to make explicit the board's exact responsibilities. For example, it is the conclusion of this committee that the board would have no control over day-to-day editorial content and should be responsible only for establishing general, long-term policies for fiscal and editorial operations of the *Daily*. The board should supervise election of the editor and select the business manager; it could dismiss either the editor or business manager by a vote of five members. Grounds for dismissal would be made explicit in the incorporating charter. Only students should be eligible for news and business positions on the *Daily*.⁷ The corporate board should also investigate the possibility of providing academic relief or other compensation for the editor of the *Daily* and perhaps for other positions as well. In addition, it should review and evaluate selection and tenure procedures for *Daily* editors.

2. The present \$28,000 subscription fee for the *Daily* should be continued but freed from all present strings. This money can be made independent through several means. First choice would be the establishment of a *Daily* Trust Fund of \$500,000 or \$600,000, which, at the rate of 5 percent, could bring in the needed annual revenue of \$25,000 to \$30,000. This fund (equivalent to the amount needed for an endowed chair) could be set up without University control through an unrestricted grant to the *Stanford Daily* Corporation.

Second choice, for a period of transition, would be a mutual understanding, embodied in a contract between the University and the publishing company, whereby the University would pay \$28,000 a year to the company to cover subscriptions for students, faculty, and staff. The contract should contain provisions for negotiating changes in the subscription fee.

In either situation, a non-cancellable lease between the University and the publishing company should be drawn up, whereby the *Daily* would be given use of the Storke Publications Building and provided with free utilities in exchange for a token annual rental.

3. Starting in 1969-70, all *Daily* profits (aside from possible staff bonuses) should be retained by the *Daily* for an improvement fund. The *Daily* should also consider an immediate increase in advertising rates.

⁷Mr. McMahon believes non-registered Stanford students should be eligible also.

We see the improvement fund as specifically enabling improvements in equipment, protection against deficit years and possible libel action, and special projects and editions in emergencies or as needed during dead week and finals. To get such a fund started, a grant of \$5,000 to the new publishing company for its first year of operation, 1969-70, should be made, without restriction, by the University.

The *Daily* is an important means of communication at a time when good and improved communication among all segments of the Stanford community is essential. Thus, it is the conclusion of the committee that as wide distribution of the *Daily* as possible is of paramount concern and that the editorial content and basic purpose of the paper should take precedence over all other considerations. We therefore support the current policy of free distribution. The \$28,000 subscription fee is presently needed to maintain at least the current level of editorial quality. Any form of individual subscriptions in the near future would be difficult financially and would seriously hamper the flow of information by reducing the number of copies distributed within the Stanford community. It is also unlikely that the entire \$28,000 could be replaced through increased advertising revenue. It would be one task of the new independent publishing board to explore all possible means of increasing revenues and endowment support so that, eventually, dependence on the \$28,000 subscription fee could be ended.

The reasons for the above conclusions are complex and involved. While the full evidence cannot be provided here, a few summary comments are in order.⁸

Organization of the *Daily* has been a problem discussed over many years. There is little common agreement on solutions among the persons interviewed for this report; in fact, business managers and editors tend simply to line up on opposite sides. Business managers are not very concerned about political and financial independence and need for change; editors are generally unhappy with present financial arrangements. Much of this conflict can be traced to the inherently different perspectives of the business and editorial sides. Much of the friction will continue and is inevitable.

Supplements to the *Daily*

Stanford University must have an additional publication medium to supplement the *Daily*. When the *Daily* does not publish, there must be a means of

⁸ Additional material is available to give further details about persons interviewed, published sources used, and the analysis carried out on *Daily* financing.

communicating information to the entire community. We recommend that when important events occur during dead and finals weeks and between quarters, a new publication or a version of *Campus Report* should be available for quick distribution to all students, staff, and faculty.⁹

In addition, we recommend that *Campus Report* be distributed regularly to students in residences and other meeting places. Currently students receive only copies of supplements to the *Campus Report*. The information contained in the *Campus Report* itself is frequently as pertinent to the lives of students as to those of the faculty and staff, and often much of it has not been printed in the *Daily* or made available to students in another form.¹⁰

As has happened in the past, there will be occasions on which the *Daily* will choose not to publish material that the University considers of major importance. The University can meet this situation best by purchasing space in the *Daily* as an advertisement and publishing the additional material.

Finally, the Academic Senate should initiate negotiations with the *Daily* for a weekly supplementary page of faculty and staff opinion, independently edited by faculty and staff members. These negotiations should include discussion of whether the Academic Senate should pay for this space.

New Student Publications

Literary and Political Magazines. A high priority should be given to the encouragement of new student publications. Stanford University has had a shifting set of ephemeral literary and political magazines. It would be inappropriate to seek to make permanent that which should shift with changing student interests and competence. But, since such outlets for creative work are a necessary part of the educational process, Stanford can assist fledgling publications by setting up a publications fund of, say, \$3,000 to \$5,000 annually, within the \$25,000 fund already recommended, and by assigning a member of the News Service or Publications Service as a permanent source of advice on printing and distributing these publications.

In addition, various publications should consider the saving in costs and the wide distribution made possible by publishing as a paid supplement to the *Stanford Daily*.

⁹ Messrs. McMahon and Snell object to the existing *Campus Report*. News covered in that publication should appear in the *Daily*. Mr. McMahon suggests that the *Stanford Observer* serve as the "quick distribution" publication during dead and finals weeks.

¹⁰ Since May 5, 1969, *Campus Report* has been distributed routinely to students in living groups and to box locations on campus.

Course Evaluation. Course evaluation by students has important implications for the entire educational enterprise, yet the level of performance has been so low that little is accomplished. We propose a set of structural changes that would improve the final product by coordinating the student activities with the activities of faculty and staff.

The University should support processes by which courses and faculty are evaluated. Such evaluations have two purposes: 1) to improve the quality of instruction, and 2) to present information to students that would assist them in course selection. Feedback of evaluation to the faculty is important for the improvement of instruction. Judicious discussion of virtues and deficiencies of courses and faculty is appropriate in assisting students with course selection and advisers with program counseling.

The published course evaluations, year after year, have been unsatisfactory. Faculty and administrators have tried to stay away from the evaluation process so that students would have control.

We propose to continue student control but recommend the participation of faculty as resource personnel on a Committee on Course Evaluations to assist in making general policy and establishing standardized procedures. Students should comprise the majority of this committee. For feedback to the faculty, an independent agency, like the proposed center for institutional research, should follow the University of Washington system in reporting results so as to improve teaching. Stanford University and ASSU should each contribute one-half of a modest subsidy for establishing standardized survey research and data processing procedures, and for publication of an annual "Scratch Sheet."¹

Non-student Publications

The mandate of the publications subcommittee, while broad, did not include publications of the Stanford University Press or the Hoover Institution, which are addressed primarily to an external audience. We were concerned with other materials produced by the University, its schools, departments, institutes, and committees.

The number of primary publications, i.e., magazines, newsletters, periodicals, posters, brochures, mailers, bulletins, directories, quarterlies,

¹ SES Report V, *Advising & Counseling*, also recommended a course review. A Provost's committee, headed by Bradley Efron, will be studying this question commencing autumn 1969.

produced at Stanford University for internal and external distribution is staggering—approximately 375 per year at a total cost (excluding salaries) of \$512,000.

In spite of the mass of publications, no one conveys the full scope of the University and its operations. The schools and departments and institutes naturally emphasize their own respective roles; and sometimes the parts overshadow the whole. Our concern is that the totality of the University's educational goals be kept in sight, and we propose some changes that may partially help achieve this goal.

Because of the complex issues raised by any attempt to consolidate or to reduce the number and costs of these publications, our committee was unable to do as thorough a review as would have been required to solve the problems that now exist. Therefore, we recommend that the Provost establish a representative committee to investigate, report on, and make recommendations about the multiplicity of departmental and institutional publications.

An early recommendation of the committee was the need to revise and expand the *Faculty-Staff Newsletter* as a major step in improving internal University communications. We are gratified that this major recommendation has been carried out in large measure by publication of the new *Campus Report*, which appears weekly during the three regular quarters and biweekly during summer quarter. Our original recommendations for coverage, which are reprinted below, read like a description of the present *Campus Report*.

News of special concern to Stanford faculty and staff, whether or not it has already appeared in the *Daily* or outside press.

Features on issues (e.g., Honor Code report, coeducational housing, pass-fail grading).

Weekly calendar of community events and departmental items previously published in the Stanford Weekly Calendar.

Official information which now goes out in all-University memos (e.g., minority hiring, changes in time schedule).

Statements of policy: changes in policy (e.g., liquor on campus, demonstrations, religious worship).

Notice of Academic Senate and Academic Council meetings (and agenda, if appropriate).

Reports of decisions of Academic Senate and summaries of Senate and Academic Council actions.

Notices of important library acquisitions or innovations in library operations or services (e.g., list airmail editions of newspapers received).

Principal committee meetings scheduled, and, to the extent possible, agenda, announcements of whether open or closed, with invitation to non-members to attend or to submit written suggestions.

Summaries of committee actions, excerpts from reports.

Summaries of Board of Trustees actions of special interest, which would not affect contracts of pending arrangements by their publication.

Excerpts from speeches and published articles that bear on the operation of the University.

As supplements, reprints of speech texts, published articles, and reports.

Letters from readers.

Question-and-answer column to serve ombudsman function.

Appointments—faculty, staff, committee. Leaves of absence. Retirements.

Personal notes, e.g., books, honors, appointments, speeches given, research grants.

Report of housing needs and housing available.

Stanford Today, Observer, Almanac.

We should continue to mail copies to the present recipients, and also mail copies to faculty and staff at their homes. (The *Almanac* presently uses only campus distribution centers for faculty and staff.) We might substitute for the Stanford Quarterly Calendar the monthly calendar of exhibits, lectures, plays, etc., printed in the *Observer*.¹² The possibility of joint mailing of at least the *Almanac* and the *Observer* should be discussed further. There might be further savings on production of the *Almanac*, with the money saved to be used to support student-oriented programs of the Alumni Association.

Other Publications

Even though the University produces hundreds of items, there appears a need for others or for some existing ones to receive wider distribution. We

¹²This action has now been taken.

recommend a staff handbook and a faculty handbook that would be revised annually, produced in modest format, and widely distributed.

The high cost of the various school, department, and University publications is a matter of some concern. These publications are so deeply entrenched that major change is probably not possible. We feel that by making the changes outlined above we can in some measure convey the full scope of the University instead of only emphasizing its parts. Our commitment is to the widest possible dissemination of information among the Stanford community of faculty, staff, students, and interested alumni. Openness should be our goal. Stanford University has one of the best combinations of alumni periodicals in the country. We should strive to do as good a job within the University community as is done for the outside community.

Athletics

Report
of the
Subcommittee

This committee has been concerned with the entire athletic and physical education program at Stanford, including the organization of intramural activities, club sports, physical education courses, and intercollegiate athletics.¹³ Together, they represent the major, organized, extracurricular activity of the University.

The athletic programs affect students in two ways: through their personal participation in sports, and through the University's participation in intercollegiate athletics. The intercollegiate program probably represents the principal, common interest of a non-academic nature in the University. This interest, with its possible psychological and integrative benefits, should not be ignored merely because many parts of the academic community find some aspects of intercollegiate athletics distasteful. These aspects are not a necessary portion of intercollegiate activity and should not obscure any possible positive aspects.

¹³ Our emphasis has been on the men's program as being the more complex, particularly because of the major intercollegiate activity. Some of our recommendations, however, relate to the women's program also.

The importance of the athletic program¹⁴ to the Stanford community is attested by the widespread participation in sports by the student body and the faculty, and even more by the continued interest in sports by students after graduation. The psychological effect and the sense of personal achievement provided by such non-routine activity and its importance to the general mental health of the students is discussed in Appendix 4. A well-organized and extensive program of athletics is particularly important on a residential, relatively isolated campus, such as ours. Stanford students are confined to a limited geographical area and to an atmosphere dominated by academic pressures; they have fewer recreational outlets available than they might at a metropolitan university.

In examining this whole program, two features obviously required attention.

First: the major extracurricular activities of the academic community, the intramural and basic physical education instruction programs, are conducted with minimal staff and facilities. In spite of the large participation, it is a peripheral and minor portion of a larger University operation, the Athletic Department, whose principal responsibilities lie elsewhere. Second: Stanford as an academic institution is involved in intercollegiate competition with other institutions whose size, academic requirements, and athletic emphasis may be quite different from its own. These problems are particularly acute at Stanford, since it is one of the few major private universities in the United States that participates in an athletic league made up principally of public institutions whose standards of admissions and academic programs may be very different from its own. Stanford has been able to live, in a sense, in two worlds—that of academic excellence and that of athletic excellence—without a great compromise in either direction. Yet its intercollegiate commitment has led to strains for which the committee has tried to find remedies.

¹⁴Sports activities are also, to some extent, a feature of the collegiate culture in other countries, e.g., United Kingdom. That they are less organized and less directed in these other countries than in the U. S. is a concomitant of the fact that the whole university program in these other countries is less organized and directed than in the U. S. There is a current tendency, at least in the academic program, for other countries to try to emulate the U. S. system, viz. the new universities in the United Kingdom and the recently announced changes in the French University system. Both systems are attempting to provide a more rounded and unifying environment for the students, to make the universities a community rather than the previous system of a series of lectures and examinations. It is interesting to note that the two British universities, Cambridge and Oxford, that offer their students the most complete communal environment also have the most extensive athletic programs, both intramural and intercollegiate.

The committee, therefore, divided its problems into two major categories:

1. The economic adequacy and the organization of the athletic, recreational, and physical education program provided for the student body, faculty, and staff. This aspect largely concerns leadership, facilities, breadth of program, financing, etc.

2. The traditional practice of intercollegiate competition. Special problems arise academically from student recruitment for teams. Probably more important problems arise from the impact of intercollegiate athletics on the participants, their relations with the rest of the University, and the interaction between their participation and the general academic requirements of the University.

Similarly, we have divided our recommendations into two sets to meet these two quite different sets of problems.

The first general set of recommendations involves change in the organization of physical education courses, intramural, and recreational programs to provide a better organized program of activities than presently exists, anticipating an extension of the program to provide a wider variety of activities to the student body (and faculty). The principal recommendation is to separate intercollegiate athletics and physical education into two departments. The Physical Education Department would be concerned with intramural sports, club sports, physical education classes, etc., while the Athletic Department would focus on intercollegiate sports.

The second set of recommendations involves more academic discrimination in recruiting, better counseling for athletes, and broader participation in coach selection, so as to promote greater integration of student athletes into the academic community. We believe these recommendations will provide the student athlete with a greater exposure to the breadth of Stanford educational and cultural opportunities.

In arriving at our conclusions, we have met with members of the Athletic Department: the athletic director, the coaches, the financial manager, the director of intramural programs, the members of the physical education instruction program, and the head of the Women's Physical Education Department. We have inspected the men's athletic facilities and have talked with a panel of male athletes. Individual interviews were conducted with athletes, with non-athletes, with representatives of the student health service, and with various faculty members. Since systematic data are largely unavailable, our approach has been general and holistic. It will be apparent that some conclusions are based on inadequate statistics and studies. For that

reason, we recommend a continuing committee and study program to examine issues raised by our broad initial inquiry.

Our recommendations start from the premise, which we believe to be valid, that a well-rounded athletic program, including basic physical education instruction, intramural and club sports, and related personal recreational activity, is valuable for both psychological and physical reasons and should be maintained and strengthened. Appendix 4, "The Psychosocial Aspects of Athletics," discusses this point in greater detail. That section is largely the product of one of the committee members, Dr. Melges, who has a professional concern with this aspect of athletics. We believe that many of these positive values can also be derived from a properly organized inter-collegiate program.

The Athletic Programs

The central educational objectives at Stanford are the search for knowledge and intellectual development and the preparation of the individual for a productive life in a rapidly changing world and society. The University is committed to the notion of a balanced education, in terms of the availability of intellectual, emotional, social, and recreational opportunities. The entire physical education and athletic program of the University should be an important part of this balanced education by contributing to the mental health and physical well-being of the students. The present separate programs of physical education, intramural sports, recreational activities, and intercollegiate athletics, embody these two aspects of the athletic program in different ways.

Physical Education. At the college level, physical education should be an instructional program designed to develop sports skills and the knowledge needed for self-selected forms of adult recreation and the maintenance of lifelong, physical well-being. It emphasizes carry-over sports activities, in which the individual will participate throughout his life. The instruction provides theoretical knowledge and understanding in relation to each specific sport. Textbooks and collateral readings on the strategic, historical, and cultural/socio-cultural aspects of the activity, written exams, and performance tests are all employed as specialized forms of instruction.

A final and important concern of physical education should be its remedial or adaptive function, largely overlooked at Stanford. Individuals with special

health, physical, or emotional problems should be counseled about their specific physical needs; they could be channeled into special individual work, or into an appropriate regular physical education course, which might be adaptable to their requirements. A closer relationship between the University Health Service, Counseling and Testing, and the Physical Education Departments would be essential for this objective to be realized.

Intramural Sports. Intramural sports are directed to the needs of students who want to compete athletically, but not at the intensive level of the intercollegiate program. The important unifying force and communal spirit of working together as a residential unit through intramural participation cannot be overlooked at a residential university. Intramural activities at Stanford offer competitive participation in touch football, basketball, baseball, swimming, water polo, wrestling, bowling, gymnastics, track and field, cross-country, tennis, golf, horseshoes, table tennis, billiards, and volleyball.

Club Sports. The club sports program affords the interested student the opportunity to organize a competitive group to participate extramurally under the leadership of interested students, faculty, and staff. The Athletic Department supports such activities as skiing, volleyball, crew, archery, cricket, fencing, judo, diving, karate, kayak, lacrosse, rifle and pistol, sailing, surfing, and ice hockey.

Recreation. Recreation is usually defined as unstructured, informal leisure-time activity. Recreational needs extend across all elements of the University community—undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and staff, and their families. It is an important aspect of the University environment because it permits an individual the chance to engage in a variety of activities of his own choosing. Such activities range from hiking and picnicking, to craft and cultural workshops, to both indoor and outdoor sports.

Intercollegiate Athletics. Intercollegiate athletics involves organized competition with other universities. In many cases, these contests are performed before a large number of spectators for an admission fee.

At Stanford, intercollegiate contests are organized in football, baseball, basketball, track, swimming, water polo, wrestling, boxing,¹⁵ rugby, soccer, gymnastics, cross-country, tennis, and golf. In most of these, there are both varsity and freshman teams, with full-time or part-time coaches paid by the

¹⁵ Beginning with the 1969-70 academic year, boxing is being discontinued as an intercollegiate sport.

University. The complexity of organization, number of coaches, and nature of student participation vary widely among the different sports. The Athletic Department believes that in order to maintain adequate teams in many of these sports, it is necessary to recruit student athletes, provide financial aid, and, in some cases, make special concessions in admission requirements. These are all common practices among the other members of the Pacific-8 Conference. There are about 40 financial awards annually to incoming student athletes; about half of these are for football, the rest are scattered among other sports, principally basketball, track, and baseball. Football also has by far the most elaborate coaching structure.

Participation

To give some indication of the amount of participation in all these various activities we quote some numbers for a typical season:

Intercollegiate competition	—630 participated, frosh and varsity (1966–67).
Physical education courses ¹⁶ (men)	—About 1,400 per quarter (1966–67). (This includes courses given for academic credit, in which specific instruction was given by a paid staff member. Owing to both staff constraints and the nature of the course itself, a portion of these statistics may involve only a minimal amount of instruction and professional supervision. Omitting these, the more realistic statistics would probably lie between 3,000 and 3,500 participants for the 3 quarters.)
Intramural participation	—5,800 for the 3 quarters (1967–68).
Club sports	—About 500 per quarter.
Women's Physical Education Department	—850 per quarter (including both men and women for some classes).

Detailed statistics for the various sports, which constitute these totals, are given in Appendix 5. None of these statistics takes into account participation by single individuals in more than one sport or for more than one quarter. We further note the disparity in the numbers among different activities.

¹⁶As an indication of student motivation in these programs, we might point out that even after the activity credit requirement was dropped for graduation, registration (excluding auditors) for physical ed courses, during the fall quarter of 1968–69, was still about 800. Even this may be an *exaggerated decrease*, since there were no instructors available for some courses.

Intercollegiate athletics, which has by far the smallest numbers involved actively, does of course provide passive spectator participation for much larger numbers.

These statistics, which vaguely indicate the importance of athletics to the student body, do not include participation by faculty, staff, and students in unorganized recreational activities—tennis, swimming, etc.—and their use of the various athletic facilities.

Departmental organization

In considering the athletic program and what changes might be desirable, it is useful to examine the organizational structure and responsibilities of both the Department of Athletics, which operates the entire men's program, and the Women's Physical Education Department, which directs all of the women's and coeducational physical education courses plus the facilities associated with them.

The Physical Education and Athletics Department has functions quite different from those of a typical academic department; its organizational structure reflects these functions. The Department is headed by a director who reports to the President of the University. Under the director, and reporting to him, is a large staff, most of whom are concerned with the intercollegiate program. Appendix 6 contains an organization chart indicating the structure of the department and the various functions of the staff.

The staff, facilities (buildings and grounds), and expenditures of the Department cover four different programs:

1. The *intercollegiate program*, which currently involves 23 coaches (football having 9), the use and maintenance of various extensive facilities (the stadium, baseball diamond, track, etc.), and the expenditure of considerable sums for equipment, operation of facilities, etc.

- 2 and 3. The *intramural program* and *club sports program*, which are jointly directed by one staff member with a budget of between \$10,000 and \$15,000 for miscellaneous expenses, including grants for club sports, payments to student referees, equipment, etc.

4. The *physical education program* for men, which is coordinated by one staff member who acts as the Director of Physical Education. He devotes only half-time to the basic physical education instruction program, part-time to research, and part-time to a professional preparation program (School of Education). The Director of Physical Education has no direct authority over

expenditures of any money for physical education and no direct authority over the people who teach in the physical education program.

There is at the present time no professionally trained, academically appointed instructor teaching full-time in the physical education curriculum. A number of the coaches, with responsibilities for coaching or assisting in the coaching of particular sports, are used to teach specific physical education courses, often not in their own specialty, in which they have no special competence or interest. This total teaching amounts to the equivalent of four to five full-time instructors. In short, the instructional needs are not being met with professionally trained instructors. Six teaching assistants are employed to do a major portion of the physical education teaching. It is our understanding that most of the TA's are doing an excellent teaching job, especially in view of the lack of professional support and guidance offered by the Department.

Aside from these courses, a varied amount of instructional time is given by the coaching staff (usually the head coach) in teaching a curriculum and instruction course in a specific sport, as part of the School of Education's professional preparation program, to the students minoring in physical education.

Some details about the distribution of costs of this program are given in Appendix 7. It is perhaps worth pointing out here, however, that roughly 50 percent of the students taking physical education are taught by the TA's (in 1967-68, 46 percent of the students in 45 percent of the classes were taught by TA's). The distribution of costs is about 11 percent for the total teaching salary of the TA's and 89 percent for the various coaches (including the Physical Education Director) who do the other teaching. This percentage includes the cost of the School of Education courses, which had a total of 53 students distributed among 9 one-quarter (2-hour) courses.

Both intramural sports and physical education instruction programs are limited by facilities. Except for the men's gym, tennis courts, swimming pool, golf course, and partial use of the track, most of the major sports facilities of the University are reserved for the exclusive use of the varsity teams. The demand for facility use by the instructional program, the intramural program, the club sports program, and the recreational needs of students, faculty, and staff is extremely high. The Department of Physical Education and Athletics has attempted to develop outdoor facilities as well as indoor facilities that will meet the needs of the programs and interest groups falling under their domain. The practice at the present time, however, does indicate that the

intercollegiate program takes precedence in all matters of utilization of existing facilities, as well as the more important planning and development of future facilities.

Women's Physical Education

In contrast to the physical education program for men, which as we have pointed out is only one of four programs administered by the Athletic Department, the program for women is offered in the Women's Physical Education Department, a department which is organized like any other academic department. It has a department head and has a full-time staff of eight people of academic rank, plus five specialists, each of whom teaches one sport only. Three of the latter are full-time, two half-time. The total direct cost to the University for the Women's Physical Education Department is about 65 percent of the amount contributed from University general funds to the Athletic Department for the men's physical education and recreation program.

Cost of programs

In a typical year (1967-68) the Athletic Department had a total income of \$2,025,000.¹⁷ Of this, the University contributed \$328,000 from general funds, earmarked for physical education and recreation. There was about \$60,000 profit from the golf course operation.¹⁸ Most of the remaining income of the Department came from receipts (\$936,000) from sports events—admission charges, radio and television payments, etc. Other sources of income—such as the gym store and coaching camps—generated costs approximately equal to income.

¹⁷ Operating figures for the past year are shown in Appendix 7.

¹⁸ Note that according to the financial statement for '67-68, the difference between golf course income and profit is about \$213,000 rather than the \$60,000 shown above. The reason for this difference is that figures quoted in this operating statement do not include all the expenses of the golf course.

Summary

In conclusion we would like to make two comments. One concerns the meager staffing and facilities available for physical education and intramural activities in the Athletic Department.

The permanent staff of the Athletic Department, excluding TA's, is minimal: the equivalent of four or five people, depending on how one counts fractional activities. Facilities are also minimal—a small inadequate gymnasium, too few tennis courts, an outdated swimming pool, and partial use of the old pavilion. The use of the old pavilion will be extended to intercollegiate gymnastics and wrestling and, presumably, to more use by the intramural programs as the new Roscoe Maples Pavilion becomes operational. The intramural sports program is conducted on playing facilities scattered over the campus and on outdoor athletic facilities, which have minimum maintenance. We have the definite impression that facility limitations have curtailed the development of the intramural and club sports programs.

Two examples of the difficulty in scheduling and utilizing facilities that intramural, club sport, and physical education programs continually encounter should make this point clear. Intramural basketball conducted during the winter quarter traditionally draws a large number of teams, with needs far exceeding the facilities available for competition. The consensus through the years has been that most teams would like to play more games than are presently scheduled. The schedule is naturally limited by the playing space available. Because of the restricted use of the track, little has been done to develop a more varied and interesting intramural track program, although students have shown considerable interest in it. The intercollegiate program seems to need most of the facility for its use, except for an annual, two-day intramural track meet. It should be pointed out, however, that the track coach offers a course in basic track and field instruction, open to all students.

The men involved in the intramural and club sports programs have made statements to us regarding problems with the scheduling of basketball, indoor volleyball, the inadequate number of tennis courts and, of course, the lack of indoor individual sports facilities, such as handball and squash courts.¹⁹

¹⁹It is interesting to recall that about three years ago, a casual campaign by a single graduate student was able to collect over two hundred signatures on a petition asking for the construction of squash courts at Stanford. (We would like to thank Mr. Ken Cooper and Dr. Robert Textor for bringing this fact to our attention.)

The second regards the dual, and perhaps incompatible responsibilities of the Athletic Department. If one looks at the structure and complexity of the intercollegiate athletic program and the problems of scheduling intercollegiate events, conference relationships, hiring of coaches, facility organization, public relations, and, above all, the need to maintain financial solvency, it is apparent that this responsibility must make by far the largest demand on the time and attention of the Athletic Director; the internal program must have secondary claim on his priorities. This statement should not imply lack of sympathy or interest in the internal program by the present Director of Athletics, who obviously is concerned and sympathetic to its improvement.

All facility planning and allocation of funds is presently done by the Athletic Director, presumably with guidance and consent from the President's office. Given the priorities in his responsibilities, it is apparent that his primary considerations will be directed to the adequacy of the plant for the intercollegiate program. Athletic directors tend to be rated primarily on their support and maintenance of intercollegiate programs.

As to the financial structure and distribution of expenditures of the Athletic Department, it is difficult to make any simple statement. As we have pointed out, the Athletics Department has quite a different relationship to the University from that of the typical department. It is treated by the Controller's Office as a facility similar to other independent agencies, such as the Stanford Press. As an autonomous entity with its own sources of income, the Athletic Department controls its own finances, determines its own budgets, and provides all its own maintenance and administrative services. Most of these services are provided by the University for the typical department.²⁰

In allocating costs inside the Department between intercollegiate athletics, physical education, intramurals, etc., part of the allocation of costs to physical education (charged against the University contribution to the Athletics Department from general funds) must include a part of internal administrative costs. This accounting practice makes it difficult to estimate the financial consequence of separating the physical education program from the Athletics Department. We include a recommendation for separation, among our other recommendations, because we believe it would improve the internal program. However, we also believe that a saving in the cost of

²⁰ The Athletic Department at Stanford is the only Athletic Department in the Conference that has financial autonomy with control of its own revenues.

operation of the physical education program would be possible if the two were separated or, conversely, that a more extensive physical education program could be provided for the same cost. Our conclusion is based partially on a comparison with the cost and organization of the Women's Physical Education program and partially on an analysis of the allocation of costs within the Athletics Department. This point is discussed in more detail in Appendix 7 on budgeting procedures. The division we recommend would, of course, require the sharing of facilities and costs. The financial and cost allocation problem will have to be considered in more detail and more professionally than we have been able to do by the financial officers of the University.

Aside from cost considerations and the advantages of focusing the responsibility for the internal athletic program in a separate department, there are other arguments for separation. The future of intercollegiate athletics everywhere may be subject to outside influences over which the University has no control. This might have major effects on the intercollegiate athletic program, but they are unrelated to the purposes of the physical education and intramural program. It seems desirable to separate the internal program from the intercollegiate program, so it is independent programatically and financially and is not subject to whatever perturbations may occur in the future of the intercollegiate program.

In summary, we believe that physical education, recreational, and intramural programs represent major extracurricula interests of the students, and the participation figures lend support to this claim. Our analysis also indicates that the scope and the support of the program at present is inadequate in both staff and facilities. It is plausible that even with the current financial support provided by the University a more extensive internal program could be organized. We do feel that an expanded internal program, providing a greater variety of instructional and intramural activities, is desirable, and we have included this as a principal part of our recommendations. We also feel that it is difficult for an internal recreational and physical education program, with its own particular set of problems, to get adequate attention when immersed in an athletic department whose principal efforts, in terms of staff, finances, facilities, etc. must be concerned with an intercollegiate program that has its own peculiar, complex problems, requiring elaborate organization. We therefore recommend the separation of these activities so that the internal program will have adequate organization and attention. The principal responsibility of a separate physical education

department²¹ would be the basic instruction of physical education courses, and the intramural and club sports programs.

Intercollegiate Athletics

If one were designing American universities from scratch, he would certainly not include in the design intercollegiate competition as it now exists. While its practices have been part of the university structures for about a half century, they have only marginal relevance to the main function of the university. In the opinion of the committee, tradition may be the only reason for the current form of intercollegiate athletics.

Intercollegiate athletics is characterized by excessive publicity; it dominates the image of the university that is seen by a substantial portion of the public; it involves special procedures, such as the recruiting of students for athletic teams, and it entails elaborate and highly professional operating organizations. These statements, to some degree, apply to essentially all major universities of the country (with one notable exception), ranging from those institutions at the top of objective academic rankings, to those which are notorious as "football" schools.

We are aware that the range of attitudes in this university toward intercollegiate athletics ranges from an uncritical enthusiasm and over-evaluation of its importance to an equally uncritical and supercilious antagonism. Correspondingly, the spectrum of possibilities for our recommendations could range from the extreme of complete abolition of intercollegiate athletic competition to the opposite extreme of increased emphasis and more intensive recruiting. However, any recommendations of this committee must be made in the context of its function, i.e., the

²¹In our meetings with various Stanford faculty concerned with both women's and men's physical education, Professors Nixon, Ruff, and Strathairn presented detailed arguments for inaugurating an undergraduate professional physical education program for men at Stanford and a complete preparation program for women, i.e., a department in which students could major in physical education and be professionally trained for various career objectives in this field. Our recommendations are not aimed at this objective but at the more modest one of enhancing the recreational possibilities for the student body. This is not to imply any disapproval of the program urged by Professors Nixon et al. We felt that their objective, dealing as it did with a new professional curriculum, did not fall within the charter or competence of our committee and that it would be inappropriate for us to take any position on such a proposal. We do want to record this attitude of those members of the Stanford faculty with professional training in physical education.

improvement of education at Stanford. Mere esthetic or ideological considerations about university structure are important only if the consequences of proposed action would make any substantive difference to the educational program at Stanford. In this light, one can ask various questions as to the impact of intercollegiate athletics on Stanford University:

1. Does it adversely affect the teaching function of the University?
2. Does it distort academic values by downgrading the academic program relative to intercollegiate athletics?
3. Does it represent a financial drain on the University?
4. Does it have an adverse or beneficial effect on non-participating students?
5. Does it have an adverse or beneficial effect on the public image of the University as seen by incoming students, to the general public, or the alumni?
6. Does it have any adverse or beneficial effect on participating students, either psychologically or in terms of their academic performance and University relationships?

Some of these questions can be answered positively, others more vaguely. We can summarize our conclusions, admittedly based in some cases on imprecise evidence, as follows:

1. *Teaching Function.* There is no evidence of any effect on the teaching function of the University. There are no "snap" courses designed for athletes and no attempts to provide special curricula for an athlete to get through the University in any way different from that of the average student.²²

2. *Academic Values.* Neither within nor without the University is there any attempt to have University goals and programs selection based on anything besides increased academic excellence. There may be differences of opinion within the faculty as to what constitutes academic excellence, but this difference is separate from and independent of influence by the athletic program. Some recruited athletes are admitted with less than the minimum formal requirements for average entering students; they are not unique in

²²Two courses were recently cited as being overly populated by athletes, but this can hardly be considered a major distortion of the academic program.

this respect. In any case, the permitted deviations from these standards are small. Of the 30 to 40 recruited athletes admitted yearly, there are probably fewer than 10 who need special concessions. These statistics may be imprecise, but not to the point of invalidating this argument.

3. *Financial Drain.* We see no evidence of any drain on the University because of the present scale and operations of the intercollegiate athletics program.

4. *Effect on Non-Participating Students.* On balance the effect is probably positive. The intellectual and academic tone of the campus is certainly not set by the existence of the intercollegiate athletic program. There is an appropriate balance in the student body. Non-athletic and even anti-athletic students on the Stanford campus do not find themselves a minority group. At the same time, a large number of non-participating students approve of intercollegiate athletics. The number of student body cards purchased for athletic games, (more than 5,000 a year, or half of the total registered student body) substantiates this fact. Whether it is the ideal focus for student spirit or not, intercollegiate athletics is probably the principal, common, non-academic interest of the student body. More than any other single activity on campus it does provide many students with a sense of community, to use a term perhaps ill-defined.

5. *Public Image.* This is hard to judge. Stanford may be associated in the public mind with institutions whose academic-athletic balance is quite different from its own. This view may downgrade the academic standing of the University in the public eye, but presumably no more than for other schools in a similar situation. Entering graduate students select schools largely on advice from their own departments; it is likely that the athletic program has no impact. Some faculty members believe that freshmen applicants may have their image of Stanford affected by intercollegiate athletics as compared, for example, to some of the Ivy League schools or the University of Chicago.

6. *Effect on Participating Students.* We have left the effect of the intercollegiate program on the participating students to the last, since this is the one area in which we think there is cause for concern. As a result of our interviews and other investigations, we conclude that there are negative effects on the athletes due to their participation in the intercollegiate program. These are problems of excessive time demands, of segregation in living units, and of lack of participation in the full scope of Stanford's

opportunities for some students because of their roles as athletes.²³ We have discussed these problems extensively in the next section and have tried to suggest remedies.

In spite of a certain degree of inappropriateness of a highly publicized intercollegiate athletic program for universities such as Stanford, our consideration of the factors listed would indicate no overwhelming reason for making a drastic change in that program. The abolition of intercollegiate athletics would not particularly improve the educational program at Stanford; it would, therefore, be merely a gratuitous concession to what many might consider a more ideal university model. Participation in intercollegiate competition in another league does not seem possible at the moment. We think that the intercollegiate program has enough positive merit to warrant its continuation in its present form, modified by our recommendations.

It is important to stress here, however, that the factors listed above do not *at present* constitute a serious problem. If there were to be major changes in these factors, they would have to be re-evaluated.

Problems of the Student Athlete

Although, like all forms of athletic activity, intercollegiate athletics may have potentially valuable psychological benefits, it also involves special problems at Stanford for the participants. These problems arise largely from three quarters: 1) the University's view of the athlete, 2) the athlete's view of himself, and 3) the coaches' view of athletes and of the University. While these images are mutually dependent, we will discuss them separately.

Athletic events are one of the most public activities that take place in the University. Public scrutiny of such activities places it under fire and raises questions on 1) policies of financial recruiting, 2) whether academic goals are being slighted, and 3) whether the level of competition is too high for a university like Stanford. To develop some criteria for judging such standards, the committee interviewed the student athletes in the belief

²³ Appendix 4 discusses the possible psychosocial benefits characteristic of athletic participation at any level of competition—intercollegiate, intramural, or casual. The evidence from our interviews and personal statements indicates that most students in intercollegiate athletics feel these personal benefits and enjoy their participation in spite of the adverse circumstances, such as time pressures and limited opportunity for other activities.

that they could provide useful evidence as to the kinds of policies Stanford should adopt. This approach is valid if the student athlete has met the academic standards of Stanford and is not unrepresentative of students in general. The committee feels that the Stanford athlete is not academically atypical, a situation which does not always occur at other institutions. Many of the questions about Stanford's athletic policies result from the unfavorable publicity that some other large universities have attracted in their athletic pursuits.

A survey made by Joseph L. Kearney, assistant athletic director, University of Washington, gives considerable insight into the motivation of Stanford athletes in coming to Stanford and in the general image of Stanford held by recruited athletes from all the schools in the Pacific-8 Conference. Appendix 10 includes the tables from this survey that present the most relevant data. They were released to Charles A. Taylor for preliminary evaluation; the full report, including the exact nature of the methodology, has not been available to us. Nevertheless, the data are interesting in that they show how Stanford is viewed by a sample of 273 football players who were recruited by one or more of the Pacific-8 Conference universities. The data indicate that the athletes ultimately choosing Stanford have the highest high school grade point average in the group. The statistics are impressive: Stanford is viewed as the most academically prestigious of the Pacific-8 Conference schools, with an intellectual atmosphere conducive to general education and the appreciation of ideas; it is thought of as the "Ivy League School of the West." The recruited athletes at Stanford came for largely academic reasons; they did not view Stanford as a consistent football power in the West.

In talking with many of the recruited athletes at Stanford, the committee confirmed the conclusion that the academic image is one of the primary drawing cards; this gives Stanford a psychological edge over some other institutions. The personal goals of many of the athletes recruited and enrolled at Stanford include the image of being primarily a student, secondarily an athlete. The factors that may disrupt the pursuit of this self-image are discussed below.

Financial Aid. About 60 percent of Stanford athletes are recruited. From our talks with coaches and student athletes, recruiting seems to be a necessary element of intercollegiate athletics at this time in the Pacific-8 Conference. Attempts are being made to cut down the rapaciousness of the recruitment policies within the conference, and the Director of Athletics at Stanford has been a strong (and somewhat lonely) advocate of this de-emphasis. However,

in order to survive in the existing level of competition, the coaches strongly feel that recruitment is still necessary; many athletes also feel this way. While at Stanford, 35 percent of the athletes receive financial aid from the Athletic Department, and 23 percent receive academic aid in the form of scholarships from the University. Some 80 percent help finance their education through jobs, one-third of them having jobs in the Department of Athletics. Although 34 percent of the athletes consider their financial aid as payment for their participation, 85 percent consider that this financial aid is a form of scholarship to assist them in achieving their education. The sample was equally divided as to whether or not men receiving financial aid got more consideration from coaches.

In an initial study by Marvin Freedman (then Assistant Dean of Undergraduate Education), 35 lettermen who were members of the class of 1965 were compared with non-lettermen. Although the numbers are small, the sample suggests that the lettermen had fewer individuals in high-ranking categories on the verbal and mathematic aptitude tests taken prior to their entrance to Stanford. While at Stanford, their cumulative grade point average was lower than that of non-lettermen, but the differences lessened by their senior year. Significantly, more lettermen than non-lettermen majored in the biological sciences, economics, and history. These data are to be compared with the recent survey (Appendix 8) of 313 Stanford athletes who were asked to give their grade point averages: below 2.0—4 percent; 2.0—2.24—15 percent; 2.25—2.49—12 percent; 2.5—2.99—39 percent; and 3.0—4.0—30 percent. This distribution is not markedly different from that of the general student body.

Another way in which athletics in a university is commonly faulted is that the time spent per week in the sport detracts from academic pursuits. According to the survey of Stanford athletes, the majority of them spend from 15 to 22 hours per week in their sports during season. About 60 percent feel that the time detracts from their academic endeavors; 53 percent feel that their grades suffer because of their participation, but the majority of this percentage feel that their grades suffer only "a little" to "very little." These statistics do not, of course, include athletes who have given up intercollegiate sports because of the factors listed here. There is no record of the number who drop out or their reasons for doing so, but there is evidence that this number is significant. The numbers quoted above—of those who do not report adverse effects—are also significant.

Despite the feeling that athletics detract from their school activity, 84 percent of the athletes feel that the time given to practice is appropriate. Seventy-three percent of the student athletes prefer to have scheduled, out-of-season practice; also, 74 percent of the football players indicate their preference for spring practice. It is interesting to note that, if they had no out-of-season practice, the time devoted to academic endeavors would be 46 percent; other physical activities 43 percent; and working out in the sport of their interest, 59 percent.²⁴ In other words, the athletes seem to want to engage in their sports activities regardless of whether or not it is scheduled. It is true that the athlete must budget his time during season, but many of them feel that this discipline is one of the important things they learn through participating in organized sports. A number of individual athletes have even stated that their grades have gone up during season.

It has been often said by non-participants that the level of conference competition is too tough for a university like Stanford. In the survey of all the varsity athletes at Stanford, however, only 8 percent felt that the level of competition was too strong; 77 percent felt that it was about right; and 15 percent felt that the level of competition was too weak. About 98 percent of the football players felt that the level of competition was about right. Ninety-seven percent of the athletes of all sports would not like to compete with teams with less strength than those of the Pacific-8 Conference. This was also true for the 73 football players queried: all but one would not want to compete against teams with less strength. Thus, whatever the opinions of the spectators, athletes judge the level of competition as being appropriate to them. Interviews with various athletes revealed that they do not want to view themselves as second-class citizens and that the present level of competition has a stimulating effect on their personal and intergroup performance.

In summary, the present combination of academic and athletic pressures is not seriously objectionable. There are individual athletes, however, who find the combination of these pressures too much for them, and they suffer both academically and socially because of it; further, some athletes do give up participation.

The image that some members of the University have of the athlete is stereotyped. These stereotypes, often expressed in cruel terms like "the jock" and "the animal" challenge the student athlete's image of himself. In general,

²⁴ Percentage inconsistencies due to multiple responses by a single respondent.

where there are problems for the student athlete, they seem to be in the area of social acceptance rather than in the realm of academic performance. This is particularly true of football players. Only 50 percent of the football players feel accepted by their student peers on the same basis as other students. About 18 percent do not feel that their academic instructors accept them on the same basis as other students. For all varsity athletes, however, the problem is not so severe. Seventy-five percent of all varsity athletes feel accepted by their student peers on the same basis as other students, and 86 percent feel that their academic instructors accept them on the same basis as other students. Thus, it seems that the majority of athletes at Stanford tend to be accepted and respected by their student peers. This is not surprising, since a large proportion of the male student body engaged in competitive athletics in high school. Some suspicion of student athletes is kindled by erroneous publicity, centering around a few examples. Care should be taken in the future to insure that the publicity acknowledges the academic priorities in admission and career goals of the student athlete at Stanford.²⁵

The problem of insufficient integration of athletics within the academic community is related to that of social acceptance of the athlete at Stanford. This may stem largely from the formation of small ingroups during the freshman year when the incoming athlete finds and forms his first friends, largely within the sport of his interest. This segregation occasionally serves as an individual's defense against broadening his horizons, but there may also be outside pressures that contribute. Some coaches demand too great a dedication on the part of their athletes with concomitant sacrifice of additional academic and extracurricular pursuits. We deplore such an emphasis. Another factor that may contribute to close ingroup formation is the tradition within the University that fosters the grouping of athletes within particular residence halls and fraternities. The small study of the 35 lettermen in 1965 suggested that most athletes live in certain fraternities and residence halls. Recommendations have been made for changing these factors.

As vague as the concept of self-image is, anecdotal evidence points to this as the area of greatest concern for most athletes. Many of them have achieved

²⁵This may become especially important with the projected increase in admission of black students at Stanford. Admission will presumably be on the basis of anticipated academic performance at Stanford. Undoubtedly some of these black students will become members of various athletic teams. Any sports publicity should certainly stress their status and performance at Stanford as students rather than merely their athletic prowess. The opposite emphasis unfortunately has been the case of many "football" schools where admission and status of athletes, both black and white, are to a large extent outside normal academic standards.

✓

self-esteem and respect through their athletic prowess, only to have it challenged when they come to Stanford. This threat to their value system may be an important growth experience, but it should be balanced by opportunity for greater integration within the academic community. The development of other value systems, rather than a closing-off from community life by retreating to ingroups, should be encouraged. Most student athletes at Stanford want to be viewed primarily as students, secondarily as athletes. At the same time, they do not want to have their role identification planned for them. Most of them feel that the University should provide choices and opportunities allowing greater exposure to other aspects of scholastic life, but they maintain that it is their right to choose the kinds of friends and activities they engage in. Obviously, we cannot legislate a value system or special housing restrictions for a particular group of students. The committee, however, feels that the University community should make a special effort to facilitate the participation of athletes in all aspects of the academic community and to diminish their special and visible public role. This serves as the underlying theme of our recommendations.

Finally, there are many uneasy tensions with regard to the coaches' view of athletes and the University. Part of the problem stems from the demands made upon coaches by groups with conflicting values, such as sectors of the alumni and academic faculty. There is widespread ambivalence about the priorities of producing outstanding teams and winning in an atmosphere that ostensibly de-emphasizes competitive athletic zeal. Our impression is that the Director of Athletics and his staff are admirably integrating these diverse demands. In our recommendations, we suggest that one way to ease the pressure of these demands is to establish a selection committee for coaches that would suitably represent the various segments of the University community. The coaches would then be selected to represent the University at large, not just the Athletics Department, which is sometimes—and unfortunately—viewed as a separate appendage to the University.

Appendix 1

Associated Students of Stanford University
Organizations
1968-69

President	Denis Hayes
Administrative Assistants	Bennett Cullum
	Jay Voss
Vice President	Victor von Schlegell
Student Financial Manager	David Swift
Assistant Student Financial Managers	Robert Appleby
	Lynn McFarland
Student Police Chief	Lawrence Stein
Sunday Night Movies Manager	Scott Keeney
Management Intern Program	Brooke Seawell
<i>Legislature</i>	
Speaker	Yale Braunstein
Liaison Officer	Michael Weinstein
<i>Art Board</i>	
President	Francie Marks
Treasurer	Michael Moreland
<i>Axe Commission</i>	
Co-Presidents	Hans Carstensen
	Eric Peterson
Rally Chairman	Kirk Brown
Secretary	Nancy Barry
Card Chairman	Tom Dee
<i>Black Student Union</i>	
Co-Chairmen	Leo Bazile
	Nate Kirtman
Treasurer	John Haygood
<i>Boathouse</i>	
Head Lifeguard	Mark Heffelfinger
Lifeguards	Eric Ebsen
	Nick Farwell
	Joe Connelly
<i>Cardinals Board</i>	
President	James Massey
Secretary	Susan Haydek
Treasurer	Robert Mallek
<i>Cheerleaders and Pom Pon Girls</i>	
Head Cheerleaders	Tim Carpenter
	Nick Farwell
Cheerleaders	Mar Agnew
	Jeff Andrus
	Eric Bachelor
	Ginger Butts
	Barbie Feller
	Sherry Dyke
	Melissa Toney
	Theresa Cady
Pom Pon Dollies	

Coffee House
President

Gregory Yahna

Education Commission
Chairman

Jeff Kane

Elections Commission
Commissioner

Robert Debs

Graduate Student Association

Yale Braunstein
Barry Askinas

International Association
President
Treasurer

Jurgen Muller
Didier Philippe Bressard

Political Union
President
Vice President
Treasurer

Neil Golden
R. Michael Huffington
Finley H. Perry

Pre-Registration Commission
Co-Chairmen

Philip Taubman
Alice Russell
Stephi Wildman

Treasurer

Ram's Head Productions
President
Vice Presidents

Kathrine M. Williams (Mrs.)
David Lash
Diane Mueller
Kathrine S. Cameron
Richard A. Walker

Secretary
Treasurer

Special Events Board
Co-Chairmen

Adam Levin
Abbie von Schlegell

Speech Association
President

Kenneth Philpot

Stanford Area Tutorial
Co-Chairmen

Sylvia Evans
Anthony Rogers

Stanford Management Intern Program
Director

Brooke Seawell

Student-Faculty Employment Committee
Student Members

John Ankeny
Donald Barceloux
Robert Huff
Clarkson Oglesby
Edward Scoles

Faculty Members

(Ex Officio) Barbara Cochran

Travel Service
Manager

Janet Giske

Women's Recreation Association
President
Vice President
Secretary
Treasurer

Mary Smith
Anne Kernwein
Joan Cleminshaw
Margaret D. Evans

PUBLICATIONS

Publications Board
Chairman

Stephanie Wildman

Prism—Freshman Literary Magazine

Stanford Blotter
Managers

Leif Ericksen
Jim Kashian

Stanford Chaparral
Editor
Business Manager

George Muser
Doug Taber

Stanford Daily
Editor
Business Manager

Philip Taubman
Marshall Schwartz

Stanford Quad
Co-Editors

Steve Webb
Bill Adams
Kent Connaughton

Business Manager

Workshop—Undergraduate Literary Journal
Editor

Vernon Oi

Stanford Literary Magazine (Sequoia)
Editor

Steve Levine

Appendix 2

Stanford Voluntary Organizations, Currently Registered
February 5, 1969

<i>Afro-West: A Theater of the Black Arts</i> Rep.—Arthur L. Wilson	<i>Community for Relevant Education (CRE)</i> Rep.—Gary G. Williams
<i>A.I.E.S.E.C.</i> Rep.—Margaret Kuzell	<i>The Company</i> Rep.—Kenard L. King
<i>Alpha Phi Omega</i> Rep.—Jeffrey Fisher	<i>Experiential Education</i> Rep.—Bob McKim
<i>American Institute of Industrial Engineers, Stanford Student Chapter</i> Rep.—Gary Steres	<i>Fellowship of Christian Athletes</i> Rep.—Paul Neumann
<i>American Society of Civil Engineers</i> Rep.—Jim Bela	<i>Go-Go to College</i> Rep.—Mary Powell
<i>Anarchist Action Front</i> Rep.—Tim J. Logan	<i>Kennedy Action Corps (Stanford subchapter of Palo Alto Chapter)</i> Rep.—Douglas Hofstadter
<i>Biafran Students</i> Rep.—Anene Nuoli	<i>LDS Student Association</i> Rep.—Dean Nielsen
<i>The Buddhist Society</i> Rep.—John McRae	<i>Mafia</i> Rep.—Pauline Adams
<i>California Committee to Legalize Abortion (Stanford Chapter)</i> Rep.—J. Hubbard Kirkpatric, Jr.	<i>Mexican-American Student Confederation (MASC)</i> Rep.—Rodolpho Cancino
<i>Campus Committee Against Police Harassment</i> Rep.—Tim J. Logan	<i>Newman Association</i> Rep.—Father Duryea
<i>Campus Crusade for Christ</i> Rep.—Gary Christiansen	<i>Okinawa Conference Committee of Stanford University</i> Rep.—Finley H. Perry Jr.
<i>Cercle Francais</i> Rep.—Linda McHarry	<i>Organization of Arab Students</i> Rep.—A. K. Abu-Hilal
<i>Chinese Students Association</i> Rep.—Lida Low	<i>Orthodox Christian Fellowship</i> Rep.—Nicholas Pappas
<i>Christian Science Organization</i> Rep.—Bill Odell	<i>Pottery Studio</i> Rep.—Gary Feldman
<i>The Coalition</i> Rep.—Pat Shea	<i>Quarterdeck Society</i> Rep.—John Peters
<i>Committee for Communications on Campus</i> Rep.—John Munger	<i>The Resistance</i> Rep.—Sommers Goff
<i>Committee for an Open Campus</i> Rep.—Yale Braunstein	<i>Scientology Stanford</i> Rep.—Dr. Y. Give'on

Sigma Alpha Iota
Rep.—Emily Bien

Sigma Phi Sigma (Stanford Pre-Medical Society)
Rep.—Russ Kridel

Society of Art Students at Stanford
Rep.—Chip Mount

Society of New Intellectuals at Stanford University (formerly Ayn Rand Society)
Rep.—James Weigl

Stanford Amateur Radio Club
Rep.—James R. Barnum

Stanford Area Young Republicans
Rep.—Michael J. Kuhl

Stanford Christian Fellowship
Rep.—Ronald J. Kernaghan

Stanford Committee for Biafran/Nigerian Relief
Rep.—Joyce Kobayashi

Stanford Committee for a New Democratic Politics
Rep.—David W. Jones Jr.

Stanford Committee for Radical Education (SCORE)
Rep.—Kim Woodward

Stanford Committee of Returned Volunteers
Rep.—Bill Kinsey

Stanford Conservation Group
Rep.—David Peter Sachs

Stanford-for-Czechoslovakia Committee
Rep.—Prof. Jan F. Triska

Stanford Debate Union
Rep.—Frank Allen

Stanford Fencing Association
Rep.—Paul Dillinger

Stanford Folk Dancers
Rep.—John C. Barton

Stanford Friends of the AFT
Rep.—Maureen Kulbaitis

Stanford Friends of KPFA
Rep.—Mrs. Sally Gilliam

Stanford Friends of the Peninsula Observer (formerly Midpeninsula Observer)
Rep.—Maureen Kulbaitis

Stanford-Germany Student Organization
Rep.—Jurgen Muller

Stanford Ice Hockey Club
Rep.—Fuller Torrey, M.D.

Stanford-in-Washington
Rep.—Karen Bjorklund

Stanford International Ballroom Dance Club
Rep.—F. (Nick) Homayounfar

Stanford Judo Club
Rep.—Reese T. Cutler

Stanford Karate Club
Rep.—George Pegelow

Stanford Libertarian Society
Rep.—Bill Evers

Stanford for McCloskey Committee
Rep.—Bob Klein

Stanford Rallye Team
Rep.—Douglas Brotz

Stanford Student Opera Guild
Rep.—Don Andrews

Stanford Photography Club
Rep.—Harry Cleaver

Stanford Shotokan Karate Club
Rep.—Manuel Uy

Stanford Ski Club
Rep.—Frank Shafroth

Stanford Students for Cranston
Darrell Johnson

Stanford Students to Recall Reagan
Rep.—Bill Kinsey

Stanford University Chapel Board
Rep.—John Kiely

Stanford University Symphony Forum
Rep.—Bruce Beron

Stanford Vapour Engine Propulsion Society (SVEPS)
Rep.—J. Laurence Pickup

Stanford Veterans
Rep.—Jim Schnieder

Stanford Volleyball Club
Rep.—Richard W. Zdarko

Stanford Young Americans for Freedom (YAF)
Rep.—Harvey H. Hukari Jr.

Stanford YWCA
Rep.—Katherine Meyer

Students for Constructive Action (SCAN)
Rep.—Nancy Jean Lyon

Students for a Democratic Society (SDS)
Rep.—Richard Bogart

Students for Humphrey
Rep.—John Endiz

Students International Meditation Society (SIMS)
Rep.—Steve Dahout

Trans-Political Non-Entity
Rep.—J. Laurence Pickup

University Christian Movement (UCM)
Rep.—Robert Bacon

Volunteers in Asia, Stanford Chapter
Rep.—Dwight Clark

The Whist Club
Rep.—Nathaniel Kirtman

Young Life
Rep.—John Kane

The Young Socialist Alliance
Rep.—Sotere Torregian

Appendix 3

Stanford Voluntary Organizations

The following is a statement of policy adopted by the Board of Trustees on March 21, 1963:

Students are encouraged to study, discuss, debate, and become knowledgeable about contemporary affairs. The expressing of opinions or taking of positions with respect to these matters is up to the individual students or to volunteer groups of students so constituted that they are authorized to speak for their members. This is not a function of student government at Stanford.

All students are required to become members of the Associated Students of Stanford University, which represents them with respect to student affairs on the Stanford campus. The student government, under this policy, is not authorized to speak for students on other matters.

Under such regulations as may be established from time to time by the President of the University, students may form voluntary organizations constituted to speak for their members with respect to matters outside the scope of student government, provided that such organizations clearly identify themselves and provided that such organizations, in any public statements, make it clear that they do not speak for the University or for the Associated Students.

Any questions concerning the interpretation and application of this policy shall be resolved by the President of the University.

Regulations Regarding Voluntary Organizations

I. Definition of a Voluntary Organization:

The term "voluntary organization" shall refer to organizations:

- A. in which membership is not mandatory;
- B. in which membership is both open and limited to members of the Stanford community, i.e., Stanford students, faculty and staff members and their immediate families;
- C. whose purposes and procedures are not inconsistent with the goals and standards of the University.

II. Registration of Voluntary Organizations:

In order to use University facilities and/or the Stanford name, and in order to advocate publicly a position on a public issue, all voluntary organizations must register with the University through the Office of the Dean of Students. As conditions of registration, each voluntary organization must file with that Office:

- A. a statement of purpose;
- B. a statement that membership is both open and limited to members of the Stanford community;
- C. a statement that all funds of the organization shall be deposited with the Students Organizations Fund (SOF) in the ASSU Office and shall be handled by the Treasurer of the organization in the manner prescribed by the rules and regulations of the Fund and of the ASSU (sectarian religious organizations which are provided with financial supervision by religious

organizations in the Stanford environs may be exempt from the requirement of membership in the Students Organizations Fund, with the approval of the Financial Manager);

D. identification of the authorized representative(s) of the group;

E. certification by the authorized representative that there are at least five active members in the organization and that each member is a *bona fide* member of the Stanford community.

Each voluntary organization must renew its registration with the University annually, during the Autumn Quarter, by submitting the name(s) of the new authorized representative(s) or by reconfirming the current representative(s); either should be done in writing. All voluntary organizations should have re-registered by the beginning of the Winter Quarter of each academic year.

III. Use of University Facilities:

Presidential Regulations, issued March 21, 1963, authorize the use of University facilities by voluntary organizations only when the University is in session, subject to the restrictions which apply during Dead Week. Consequently, a voluntary organization may not hold meetings, either public or closed, in University facilities during University recesses. This prohibition applies to all University facilities.

A. Closed Meetings of Voluntary Organizations:

A voluntary organization which is registered with the University may use University facilities, subject to scheduling, for meetings which are limited to members of the group and to specifically invited guests.

B. Open Meetings of Voluntary Organizations:

A voluntary organization which is registered with the University may use University facilities for meetings which are open to more than its own members and to specifically invited guests, subject to the regulations of the Committee on Public Exercises.

C. Open Meetings of Voluntary Political Organizations:

A voluntary political organization which is registered with the University may use University facilities for meetings which are open to more than its own members and to specifically invited guests *only* under the sponsorship of the Political Union and subject to the regulations of the Committee on Public Exercises.

D. Open Meetings of Voluntary Religious Organizations:

A voluntary religious organization which has registered with the University may hold open meetings *only* under the sponsorship of the Office of the Dean of the Chapel.

IV. Positions on Public Issues:

A. Positions on Public Issues Taken by Voluntary Organizations:

A registered voluntary organization may advocate publicly a position on a public issue, provided such an organization clearly identifies itself, and provided such an organization in any public statement makes it clear that it does not represent or speak for the University or for the Associated Students.

B. Positions on Public Issues Taken by Student Publications:

An official student publication may take editorial positions on public issues, provided the publication makes it clear that, in so doing, it does not represent or speak for the University or for the Associated Students.

Appendix 4

Psychosocial Aspects of Athletics at Stanford

Introduction

This appendix was written primarily by one of our committee members, Dr. Frederick T. Melges of the Department of Psychiatry, who is grateful to his colleague, Dr. John Maurer, of the Cowell Student Health Center, for providing valuable guidelines and discussions of many of the psychosocial issues of athletics at Stanford. Dr. Melges points out that some of the views presented here represent selected professional opinion, which, although supported by the limited data available, will require further study. Dr. Melges and Dr. Maurer have already laid the groundwork for certain research projects relevant to some of the suggestive leads; they will pursue these efforts if funds become available. With further research, other views may become more tenable. As a general statement of what we know now, however, the majority of the committee feels that the presented views are plausible. One committee member, L. P. Ruotolo of the Department of English, has expressed disagreement with the emphasis of this section and particularly with the criteria of desirable emotional development in students. His statement, pointing up some other criteria than those tacitly assumed in this section, is attached at the end of this section. We hope that controversy such as this will encourage the search for more definitive information upon which educated decisions can be made.

The Potential Value of Athletics

Athletic activity has the potential of contributing to both physical and psychological development. Whether these potential values are being fully realized at Stanford is an open question. There are those who hold that athletic activity is irrelevant and perhaps contrary to academic pursuits, while others see no conflict. By outlining what the potential values might be, we hope to be able to pose our questions more precisely in order to find criteria by which to evaluate the overall present and future programs at Stanford. Some of these potential values might be better realized if the intercollegiate portion of the program were less competitive, although this is not obvious from the evidence we have compiled. Even though at the present time we have no definite answers to this issue, its obvious relevance should keep Stanford wary about its long-term commitment to an increasingly competitive conference.

We will deal primarily with the potential psychological value of athletics. The importance of physical activity in maintaining physiological functions and increasing longevity is well known. This is particularly true for the prevention of cardiovascular disease. Our focus, however, will be on the possible psychosocial benefits of athletics. Despite many vehement and contrasting opinions about this aspect of athletics, there has been surprisingly little research in this area. Moreover, the potential psychosocial benefits of sports activity has not been given any kind of clear conceptualization that would make the problem readily amenable to research. It is hoped that future studies at Stanford can take a lead in conceptualizing and examining some of these issues.

One way of conceptualizing the potential psychological value of athletics is to ask if it creates opportunities for emotional growth and, if so, how. Three factors, among others, appear especially relevant to emotional development: 1) the enhancement of interpersonal relationships, 2) getting a firm view of the self, and 3) the commitment, modification, and realization of personal goals. If athletic activity offers opportunities to develop in these areas, the potential psychological value of such activity is to some degree being realized.

How can we know if such opportunities are being created and are being taken advantage of? These are difficult questions. One recourse might be to judge athletics in terms of its effect on academic success. To judge the value of athletics solely in terms of academic achievement is, however, misleading, for in this approach many of the unique features of athletic activity get lost. Athletics should be evaluated on their own right, providing that they do not significantly impair the central academic pursuits of the student athlete.

A possible approach would be simply to get the student athlete's personal reactions to the opportunities available through their participation. This has been, because of lack of time for more sophisticated methods, a major approach of our committee.

Before trying to describe just how athletic participation might enhance emotional development in terms of interpersonal relationships, the self-image, and goal-directed behavior, we can get some indication of the realization of some of these potential values by citing from a statement from Student Council on Athletics (see Appendix 9): "Athletics also teaches the athlete the strong dependence he has on others. . . Not only is the athlete able to observe his own response, but he is also able to improve his response to pressure and intense situations by constantly conditioning under it. . . By constantly responding to pressure with an inner drive, the athlete learns to place a reliance on his own capabilities. . . For some athletes, the coordinated use of body and mind provides the primary motivation. For others, the completely physical and spontaneous environment of the athletic field offers a temporary break from the grind of the classroom and study. . . Some athletes, during moments of competitive performance, are able to rise above what they are, above what they can and cannot do. . . The challenge associated with highly competitive athletics provides another motivation for some athletes. . . There is one motivation which is truly common to all participants: the desire to do something well and the feeling of self-satisfaction in doing it." Although this statement was made by a group of varsity athletes, it would apply, as would the following paragraphs, to any sport participation.

This feeling of competence and efficacy—that is, the capacity to make events happen—is fundamental to self-esteem and identity. The more explicit are the criteria for judging outcomes, the greater are the chances for making precise self-evaluations of performance. Since sports activity produces readily visible and immediate effects, it may be especially relevant to developing a sense of efficacy.

But let us be more specific as to how athletic participation might enhance emotional development in terms of the above-mentioned general factors of interpersonal relations, self-image, and goal-directed behavior. Emotional development implies neither stoicism nor histrionics, but rather the capacity to become deeply involved and committed to goals shared with others, and to use feelings in the service of these pursuits instead of being controlled by angers, anxieties, and prejudices. There is some evidence that athletes are more physiologically reactive to stress; at the same time they can tolerate and hold up under stress to a remarkable degree. We list some of the factors that might account for findings like these.

First, as to interpersonal relations, athletic participation has the potential of enhancing 1) interdependence on others and 2) the channelization of aggression within codes of social conduct. An athlete has to learn to trust others in a competitive situation; he has to rely on his teammates. Comradarie and loyalty are part and parcel of many sports, especially team sports. There are also great opportunities for identification with peers. Model coaches and peers may serve as teachers of how to react to stress and how to handle pressure. Of the 313 varsity athletes responding to the general questionnaire (see Appendix 8), the vast majority feels that the coaches at Stanford, judged in relation to the quality of instruction they get in their academic subjects, give superior instruction. This may be a consequence of getting substantially more personal instruction from their coaches than from their academic instructors. A feeling of trust and reliance is created in an atmosphere where both adult and student are working together toward common goals.

Equally important to the interdependence upon others is the channelizing of aggression provided for by athletics. To quote Konrad Lorenz, the renowned ethologist whose book *On Aggression* discusses the importance of athletics in modern society: "The value of sport. . . is much greater than that of a simple outlet of aggression in its coarser and more individualistic behavior patterns, such as pummeling a punch-ball. It educates man to a conscious and responsible control of his own fighting behavior. Few lapses of self-control are punished as immediately and severely as loss of temper during a boxing bout. More valuable still is the educational value of the restrictions imposed by the demands for fairness and chivalry which must be respected even in the face of the strongest aggression-eliciting stimuli." (p. 272) Moreover, in modern day society, the issues of "territoriality" (that is, the boundaries of personal or group sovereignty, which are protected from invasion by others) are often unclear, and the accepted codes of conduct are often undefined. Most sports, however, provide means for the expression of aggression within highly socialized rules. Territorial boundaries and competitive group commitments are spelled out clearly within codes of conduct that provide standards for channelizing aggression. A high hope would be that this kind of participation, often described in the hackneyed but valuable terms of "sportsmanship" and "fair play," would carry into other spheres of community living.

With regard to the view of the self, athletics may help the participant to see himself more clearly, to get a view of how others see him, and to strive for his ideal self. The sheer physical activity enhances his body image by establishing the person as an agent of action and firming up the boundaries of the self-other interface. The athlete has to perform under pressures from peers and authorities. This is a fact of life, and learning to handle it is a part of each individual's emotional growth. The athlete also has to learn to know what he can and cannot do. He has to set certain goals for himself and realize those which can be accomplished. In this way he can tease out fact from fantasy in certain aspects of his self-image.

Besides deepening interpersonal relations and firming up the view of the self, athletic participation can potentially streamline goal-directed behavior.* There is increasing evidence that orientation towards goals and planning to meet various goals are key elements in mental health. An essential aspect of athletic participation consists of practice in goal-setting and planning. Moreover, the results of physical performance are usually immediately visible and public. The athlete therefore gets prompt feedback upon which to base his satisfactions and frustrations. This atmosphere of short-range goals is very different from the long-term pursuits of academic life and building a career. The clarity of goals in an environment aids the development of self-esteem. The individual has to have some concrete criteria by which to judge his performance. Just so the emphasis is on enhancing self-performance, rather than merely winning or beating somebody else, this orientation toward achieving short-term goals is a basic and healthy endeavor. It is quite possible that athletes, as a group, see themselves as agents who have some control over what will happen to them in the environment; they tend not to see themselves as passive pawns within a series of accidental environmental happenings. The suggestive evidence on this is being explored more systematically at Stanford.

We will mention two studies that, along with the clinical appraisal of the behavioral scientists and student athletes interviewed at Stanford, support the above-mentioned psychosocial values of athletics. We would also suggest that support be provided for similar but more extended studies specific to Stanford. In sustaining a "spirit of self-examination and self-renewal," recommended by the Steering Committee of the Study of Education at Stanford, it will be important to delineate much more precisely the values of such a major operation as the athletic program within the Stanford community.

The first study comes from Yale University—a university of comparable goals and standards to that of Stanford. James S. Davie of the Mental Hygiene Clinic of Yale reported in 1956 that the clinic sees significantly fewer athletes than non-athletes. The patients who participated little in athletics, when describing what they liked most about their experience at Yale, failed to mention the social-interpersonal-extracurricular side of college. Davie points out, however, that seeing fewer athletes in the clinic does not necessarily mean that athletes were more "problem-free." They may have been able to sublimate their personal difficulties through athletic activity or the coaches may have been functioning, consciously or unconsciously, as therapists. It has also been suggested that this lesser clinical contact by athletes may have been, in part, due to an attitude by athletes that such contact was "unmanly," a sign of weakness.

Davie's results were corroborated in a study conducted at West Point by Kobes in 1965. The incidence of cadets who were discharged or who resigned for psychiatric reasons during their four years' academic course at West Point was greatest in those whose standard score rating at the entrance physical aptitude was lowest; by contrast, not a single student in the top 7 percent of physical fitness was discharged for psychiatric reasons. We must stress, however, that the Yale study is more relevant to the demands of the environment at Stanford.

The second study concerns the psychological consistencies within the personality of high-level competitors reviewed and investigated by Oglivie (1968). Although there is insufficient evidence and methodological hindrances for claiming that high-level competition "causes" certain positive personality features, those individuals who retain their motivation for athletic competition have most of the following personality traits: 1) with regard to interpersonal factors, top-level athletes have emotional stability, extroversion, tough-mindedness, and high conscience development. 2) Their self-image is characterized by self-confidence, self control, and autonomy. 3) Traits such as ambition, organization, endurance, deference, and assertiveness indicate the nature of their goal-striving.

*By goal-directed behavior we do not imply merely drive toward external achievement in a competitive milieu, but rather drive toward personal specific achievements, meeting inner and private goals.

There is significant disagreement, even among members of the committee, about whether certain of the traits mentioned are necessarily positive in an academic institution that, above all, values unrestricted pursuit of knowledge.* Deference may be considered a negative quality if it implies unquestioning obedience to authority. We still need to know if participation in athletics at Stanford enhances such traits, if such traits are *relevant* to the Stanford student, and, if high-level competition is required, whether such competition may not be at cross purposes with other goals of the university.

Conclusion

In summarizing the potential psychosocial values of student participation in athletics, it would appear that sports activity offers opportunities for self-actualization and emotional growth, and the information that we have thus far suggests that some of these potential values are being realized at Stanford. Of the Stanford athletes surveyed (see Appendix 8), over 98 percent say they enjoy their participation. Ninety-two percent felt that participation in competitive sports gives benefits (other than financial aid) that otherwise would not be available at Stanford. Unfortunately, that survey did not include those former athletes who gave up intercollegiate athletics, so we are not able to assess their reasons for their actions and thereby identify some of the troublesome aspects of the intercollegiate program for student athletes. We can certainly assume that participants in intramural and club sports would have the same positive reaction to their athletic activity without the possibly unpleasant pressures of intercollegiate activity.

Aside from contributing to personal development of the participants, an athletic program also has the potential of acting as a source of institutional cohesion and identification for many of the students. Even though athletic contests might not be the ideal focus for such identification, with a student body such as that at Stanford, there is no danger of athletic partisanship becoming exaggerated. To quote one psychologist who has studied social issues at Stanford for some time: "For the university as a social institution, an athletic program enhances a sense of community through the shared experiences with the spectators. It facilitates the student's identification with the institution, since an athletic team is essentially representing the school and since it is pitted against other schools.† It does contribute to a sense of community, which is constructive psychologically for most members of the community. Also, athletics probably contribute greatly to the relief of tension generally demanded by a competitive intellectual atmosphere. This is true for both spectators and participants, and for varsity, intramural, and the enormous quantity of informal athletic activity that takes place at Stanford. We may quote here from a related study from another university: "One of the great rewards to be found in sports in a society becoming increasingly depersonalized and employed in routine jobs is the opportunity to preserve one's individuality and to find one little corner of personal achievement." Although varsity competition may place considerable pressure on athletes, they also supply a means for release of tension in a way that is not true for the academic realm.

In outlining the potential values of athletics within a university, we must be careful to point out that the maximum realization of such potentials, whether in personal development, a sense of community, or relief of tension, may not be possible at Stanford without doing violence to other academic objectives. Attempts to realize these potential values through athletic programs should always be secondary to the central academic pursuits of the University. (The semi-professional aura of the athletics programs of some universities must be avoided.) The realization of many of the above values does not require an increasingly high-powered intercollegiate program. The Ivy-League schools exemplify this.

Although the realization of some of the potential values does not seem antithetical to the central purposes of the University community, Stanford should be watchful of over-emphases that might defeat these educational goals.

*See dissenting comment by Professor Ruotolo. (p. 70).

†These comments could also apply to intramural or club sports, and other extracurricular activities involving competition, e.g. debate.

References

- Lorenz, Konrad. *On Aggression*. Harcourt, Brace, and World, Inc. (Bantam edition), 1967.
- Davie, James S. "The use of a college mental hygiene clinic." *Yale Stud. Med.* 4(2): 74-83, 1956.
- Kobes, Frank. "West Point studies concerning the predictive value of initial physical performance levels of freshmen." In Symposium: What is Sportsmedicine? 12th Ann. Meeting Am. Coll. Sportsmed., Dallas, Texas, 1965.
- Oglivie, Bruce C. "Psychological consistencies of competitors." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 205(11): 780-786, 1968.
- Kearney, Joseph L. (Assistant Athletic Director, University of Washington). "The Views of Recruited Football Players in the Pacific 8 Conference." Preliminary data in preparation for a Ph.D. thesis. Cited with permission.

A dissenting view

Professor Melges argues persuasively that an athletic program (both intercollegiate and intramural) is of significant value for the university student. While my disagreements point chiefly to a matter of emphasis, there exists a substantive difference I would like to express. It involves the presuppositions implied in statements such as "*positive* personality features" (my italics).

Perhaps from a clinical standpoint problems of emotional stability and mental health demand the therapy Professor Melges encourages. Must we assume, however, that in all situations qualities such as "extroversion" and "toughmindedness" are necessarily "positive," or, for that matter, that a "firm view of the self" or the "realization of personal goals" is necessarily relevant to "emotional development"? I stress "necessarily" because I believe the university is characterized by a diversity of anthropologies. We have, in other words, different views concerning "constructive" behavior. If, for example, the intention of some teachers is to oppose in their students those self-reinforcing identifications that prevent critical thinking, some may consider the effect of such pedagogy a healthy tension. Yvor Winters, one of Stanford's most famous humanists, aptly termed the alternative "chimpanism." The consequent *loss* of self-confidence and autonomy can be viewed from this perspective as the first step in the student's emotional and intellectual development.

The question that remains unanswered for me is whether Stanford's strong emphasis upon intercollegiate athletics is conducive to the broadening of intentions we associate with liberal education.

Lucio P. Ruotolo
Department of English
Stanford

Appendix 5 Statistics on Athletic Participation

Department of Physical Education & Athletics
Stanford University
INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC PARTICIPATION STUDY
Season of Competition - 1966-67

BASEBALL, Frosh	30a	Spring	16
BASEBALL, Varsity	130a	Spring	23
BASKETBALL, Frosh	11a	Winter	15
BASKETBALL, Varsity	111a	Winter	16
BOXING	112	Winter	17
DIVING	124a	Winter	3
FOOTBALL, Frosh	14a	Fall	61
FOOTBALL, Varsity	114a	Fall	87
GOLF, Frosh	15a	Spring	9
GOLF, Varsity	115a	Spring	13
GYMNASTICS	116a	Winter	20
RUGBY, Frosh	140	Winter	39
RUGBY, Varsity	140a	Winter	53
SOCCER, Frosh	39a	Fall	22
SOCCER, Varsity	139a	Fall	35
SWIMMING, Frosh	20a	Winter	21
SWIMMING, Varsity	120a	Winter	23
TENNIS, Frosh	21a	Spring	13
TENNIS, Varsity	121a	Spring	11
TRACK, Frosh	22a	Spring	31
TRACK, Varsity	122a	Spring	34
CROSS COUNTRY, Frosh	22a	Fall	8
CROSS COUNTRY, Varsity	122a	Fall	9
WATER POLO, Frosh	29a	Fall	17
WATER POLO, Varsity	129a	Fall	18
WRESTLING, Frosh	23a	Winter	4
WRESTLING, Varsity	123a	Winter	12
TOTAL:			630

Footnote: These enrollments include only those completing the season. Approximately 800 students try out for intercollegiate sports during each year.

Department of Physical Education & Athletics
PHYSICAL EDUCATION PARTICIPATION STUDY
 1960-67

Activity		Year						Physical Education	
		59/60	60/61	61/62	62/63	63/64	64/65	65/66	66/67
Baseball	30						16		
Basketball	11	98	98	105	127	92	141	110	112
Bowling	19a							27	16
Bowling	19	258	306	273	343	321	416	359	367
Boxing	12	109	118	90	107	93	96	92	83
Crew	27	113	155	79	101	82	152	107	90
Diving Beg.	24	41	58	52	33	38	14	15	17
Diving Adv.	124	22	20	20	8	7	9		
Golf Beg.	15	229	249	271	275	282	262	271	287
Golf Adv.	115	273	250	256	232	264	186	165	158
Gymnastics	16 & 116	61	73	85	99	100	92	77	59
Judo	113 & 113b						57	36	87
Life Saving	118		40				59	52	38
Marksmanship	151	185	182	208	282	405	280	117	113
Pistol Marks.	151b							36	71
Modified Progs.	02	4	7	9	6	4	5	9	9
Phys. Cond.	41	120	105	193	209	167	221	154	128
P.E. Leadership	05							23	94
P.E. Partic.	04							101	176
P.E. Seminar	03							10	
Rugby	140							54	39
Skin and Scuba									
Diving	142 & 142b						62	167	176
Soccer	139	77	107	115	67	90	72	35	22
Swimming	20a	44	38	30	28	35	35	51	51
Swimming	119 & 120	294	286	239	122	123	111	74	74
Team Games	17b				142	123	76	38	6
Table Tennis	19b								37
Tech. of Athl.	192,								
Management	193, 194	76	94	103	109	100	144	172	83
Tennis	21	360	390	430	268	267	237	315	273
Tennis	121	368	422	363	296	185	205	312	353
Track	22	111	63	133	85	51	54	53	51
Volleyball	17	214	245	156	152	119	107	132	211
Water Polo	29			22	20	58	94	105	105
Water Safety	128 & 128b					38	34	91	58
Weight Trng.	153	410	374	502	630	635	697	906	900
Wrestling	23	33	15	45	32	32	48	53	50
Totals		3500	3695	3879	3773	3701	3982	4319	4394


Stanford Department of Athletics
INTRAMURAL PARTICIPATION RECAPITULATION

<i>Sports</i>	59/60	60/61	61/62	62/63	63/64	64/65	65/66	66/67	67/68
BASKETBALL	745	760	760	800	760	660	864	1026	1070
BOWLING	160	160	160	160	150	220	160	160	320
BOXING	24	30	18						
CROSS COUNTRY	50	50	64	71	81	125	95	75	52
FOOTBALL	300	800	800	770	760	540	820	1305	1170
FREE THROWS	114	99	114	102	111	250	195	174	165
GOLF								128	104
GYMNASTICS	30	32	32	44	35	10	10	25	14
HANDBALL	48								
HORSESHOES	76	112	116	152	152	85	126	160	128
POCKET BILLIARDS					90	120	117	138	288
SOFTBALL	534	621	630	580	580	450	539	720	792
SWIMMING	100	123	100	115	83	216	65	68	80
TABLE TENNIS	132	180	100	175	183	150	144	184	120
TENNIS	175	136	174	210	252	250	210	456	286
TRACK & FIELD	155	161	184	208	180	183	175	88	210
VOLLEYBALL	550	537	590	560	580	548	744	690	706
WATER POLO							48	46	22
WEIGHT LIFTING							140	152	62
WRESTLING	112	175	172	157	182	227			
TOTAL ENTRIES	3305	3978	4014	4104	4189	4034	4452	5595	5789

ANNUAL INTRAMURAL PARTICIPATION TOTALS 1967-68

Fall Quarter										
Activity	Teams	Ave. Team Mems.	Total Parts	# Leags.	# Tms. in Leags.	Sch. Cont. Each League	TTL. Sch. League Cont.	Play Offs	TTL. Sch. Conts.	Part Total
Bsktball	55	3	165	T				63	63	378
Fr. Throw										
Billiards	48	3	144	8	6	15	120	Winter		720
Bowling	40	4	160	5	8	28 x 3	420	Winter		3,360
Cross Country	12	3-5	52	1 Race					1 Race	52
Touch Football	78	15	1,170	13/1	6/5	15/10	215	28	233	6,990
Golf	52	2	104	T				63	63	252
Tennis Doubles	75	2	150	T				74	74	296
Two Man Villyball	89	2	178	T				88	88	352
Totals	449		2,123				755			12,400
Winter Quarter										
Bsktball	107	10	1,070	12/7	6/5	15/10	250	41	291	5,820
Billiards	48	3	144	8	6	15	120	18	138	828
Bowling	40	4	160	5	8	84	420	22	442	3,536
Table Tennis	40	3	120	5 Dbl Elim	8	56	444	5 Team Dbl Elim	452	2,712
Weight Lift.	11	2	22	T				3x22	66	66
Wrestling	15		62	T		54			54	108
Totals	261		1,578				1,234	111	1,443	13,070
Spring Quarter										
Gymnast.	8	2	14	T		7 Events			50	50
Hrsshoes	32	4	128	T					23	184
Softball	66	12	792	11	6	15	165	24	189	3,402
Swimming	16	5	80			10 Events				160
Tennis	68	2	136	T					57	228
Track & Field	36	6	210			14 Events 30 Heats				240
Villyball	66	8	528	11	6	15	165	26	191	2,292
Water Po.	20	10	200	4	5	10	50	8	58	812
Totals	312		2,088				380			7,368
Grand Totals	1,022		5,789							32,838

Appendix 6



Appendix 7

Financial Structure and Budgeting Practice
of the Athletics Department

As an aid to any future analysis of the problem of separating the physical education program, including intramural and club sports, from the Athletics Department, we are outlining here the current financial structure of the Department of Athletics and Physical Education and its method of allocating costs.

Some of the material for this appendix has been discussed with Mr. Robert Butler, Business Manager of the Athletics Department, and with Messrs. Creighton and Worley of the Controller's Office. However, they bear no responsibility for statements made here. The numbers quoted in this appendix will all be 1967-68 operating figures, as a typical operating year for the Department although there may be variations in costs, income, and expenses from year to year.

In analyzing the various figures quoted—income, expense, allocation costs between physical education and intercollegiate athletics—it must be kept in mind that the Athletics Department has a relation to the University quite different from the typical department. It is treated by the University, i.e. the Controller's Office, as an independent facility, similar to, for example, the Stanford Press. As a separate entity, with its own sources of funds, the Athletics Department is almost completely autonomous in controlling its own finances and determining its own budgets. It provides all of its own accounting, purchasing, facilities maintenance, and other services, all of which are paid for out of its own funds; in a typical department, most of these services are provided by the University. These constitute the University's overhead costs, which normally must be included in estimating the cost of operation of any single academic unit. Since the University does not provide these services* for the Athletic Department, such a cost does not apply to its operation.

The University does make a contribution from general funds to the Athletics Department to cover the costs of the physical education, intramural, and club sports program, and the special status of the Athletics Department means that in allocating costs inside the Athletics Department between intercollegiate activities, on the one hand, and physical education, intramurals, etc., on the other, part of the allocation of costs to physical education, etc. (charged against the University contributions) must include a part of the internal administrative costs. We will consider this in somewhat greater detail after stating some of the figures. These comments are relevant because if the physical education program is separated from the Athletics Department, it will be necessary to make some estimate of the cost of the various University overhead services supplied to the new Physical Education Department. The actual incremental cost to the University—that is, the actual additional cost incurred by the University in having to provide administrative services to a Physical Education Department—would not necessarily be a pro-rated share of the total University overhead. This bookkeeping factor, among others, complicates a simple, financial analysis of the cost of separation. We will return to this again after stating the figures. Given below is a financial statement for 1967-68.

*One minor service is provided—payroll processing—which essentially means writing out the payroll checks; the Athletics Department is charged some nominal cost for this.

Department of Physical Education and Athletics

	ACTUAL
OPERATING STATEMENT	1967-68
Income:	
Football	\$ 593,513
Basketball	37,366
Radio/Television	145,529
Rose Bowl	94,831
Other Sports Activities	92,094
Golf Course	471,460*
Gym Store	75,101
Coaching Camp	104,162
Faculty Gym Cards	1,795
University Physical Ed. & Recreation Appropriation	328,400**
University Building Rentals	7,300
Interest Income	74,144
Less Designation of Income for:	\$ 2,025,695
Plant Additions & Reserves	(275,294)
	\$ 1,750,401
Expense:	
Games Expense	\$ 174,652
Sports Expense	255,683
Golf Course	257,911*
Gym Store	68,400
Coaching Camp	78,303
Plant Operations & Maintenance	164,703
Major Plant Repairs & Improvements	45,993
Department Salaries & General Expense	625,379
	\$ 1,671,024
OPERATING INCOME	\$ 79,377

The University appropriation to the Athletics Department, from general funds, for physical education, labeled** above, contributes to various departmental costs according to an agreed-upon formula. Listed below is this allocation of costs *budgeted* for 1967-68, and the percentage of total Athletics Department budget for that category. The actual operating figures for that year recently made available (in parentheses) do not differ significantly. It is to be noted that the departmental estimate of the cost to be allocated to physical education is somewhat greater than the University contribution to the department. This obviously depends on the formula used in allocating costs.

*It should be pointed out that the difference between the two items, golf course income and golf course expense, \$213,549, is not necessarily the net profit of the golf course. Some of the actual costs of operating the golf course are not included in this listed expense item but come out of the general departmental operating services. The actual profit from the golf course is estimated to be considerably less. This is mentioned here because in considering sources of net income for the intercollegiate athletics program and physical education program, golf course profit has to be allocated according to some formula, particularly if the two activities are separated, and we are merely stating that the amount available is not as large as might be indicated by the numbers quoted.

Department of Physical Education and Athletics
Estimated Physical Education/Faculty-Staff
Recreation Expense

Expense	<i>Actual 1967-68</i>	<i>Budget 1967-68</i>	<i>% of Total Department Budget</i>
Salaries:			
P.E. Staff-Coaches-Admin.	\$ 109,000	\$ 118,000	33.5
Office	26,000	28,000	30.8
Student Lifeguards	5,000	3,000	
Sub-total	140,000	149,000	
Staff Benefits	16,000	16,000	
Total	\$ 156,000	\$ 165,000	
S & E Expense	29,000	27,000	38.5
Equipment & Sports Expense	15,000	12,000	24.0
Grounds & Building O & M:			
Payroll	\$ 58,000	64,000	62.0
Staff Benefits	7,000	7,000	
Supplies, Equip. & Utilities	43,000	40,000	
Total	\$ 108,000	\$ 111,000	
Major Plant Improvements and Repairs	\$ 26,000	30,000	Allocated
Club Sports	9,000	10,000	100.0
All other Categories	7,000	7,000	Allocated
Total	\$ 350,000	\$ 362,000	

The item listed above under Salaries for P.E. Staff-Coaches-Administration contains the cost of all the teaching and direct administration of the physical education courses, intramurals, and club sports, plus a fraction of the over-all Athletics Department administrative costs, plus payments to coaches of major sports who teach a "curriculum and instruction" course in a specific sport for the School of Education's professional preparation program for students minoring in physical education.

The other items—on grounds, buildings, operations, maintenance, for example—are allocations of costs for facilities used in common by physical education and the intercollegiate athletics. It should be pointed out specifically that some major facilities like the stadium, etc., which are used largely for intercollegiate athletics, are not included in this costing procedure and are listed elsewhere as being paid out of the intercollegiate portion of the Athletics Department budget.

A more detailed breakdown of the salary item (based on *actual* salary allocation for 1967-68 rather than estimated budget) has been recently made by the Controller's Office. We shall summarize some of these results here, since it is illuminating in trying to isolate the various costs included in this one salary item and in projecting what the costs might be of a separate Physical Education Department.

If one considers this detailed breakdown of the salaries allocated as a physical education cost and separates it into two groups, one paid for teaching or direct administration of the physical education program and the other paid as a part of the total Athletics Department administration costs, one gets the following division in percent:

Teaching	66%
Athletics Department Administration	34%

Under teaching here are included all the salaries charged for people who do some teaching in physical education. This includes part-time teaching services of some of the coaches of minor sports, the TAs, the total salary of the director of the physical education program, Professor Ruff, and part of the salary of Professor Nixon. The teaching by the coaches, almost entirely by coaches of minor sports, is about the equivalent of four man years. Also included is the charge for the "curriculum and instruction courses" in specific sports in the School of Education. These courses in 1967-68 had a total of 53 students distributed among 9 (2-hour) courses. The total salary charge for this service was about 11 percent of the total teaching cost listed here.

The 34 percent fraction represents the administrative costs charged to the physical education and intramural program by the Athletics Department. The administration cost item does *not* include office salaries charged to physical education. If we add these, then the salary breakdown becomes:

Teaching	53%
Administration & office salaries	47%

This would seem to be an unusually large administrative cost, particularly since the actual administration of physical education teaching (Professor Ruff) is included in the teaching cost. Undoubtedly, this allocation is an acceptable one in an accounting sense since the allocation is done with the knowledge of the University financial officers. However, there is no doubt that any purely accounting method of allocating administrative costs between two activities with widely discrepant administrative needs cannot help but penalize the administratively less complex activity.

These figures certainly indicate that if all the personnel directly involved in the physical education program—teaching plus the necessary internal administration—were charged as a direct cost to a separate physical education department, the totals involved would be certainly very much less than the total staff plus office salaries listed here. The cost of University-supplied services cannot be judged, but even with these included, it seems highly likely that the total administrative costs—both internal and University-supplied—would be considerably less than under the present organizational arrangement.

It has not been possible to make any similar breakdown of other allocated costs—S&E, etc. A precise evaluation will require a more professional analysis.

One more set of statistics is significant—the division of the total teaching load, the number of students, and number of courses taught, between the TAs (plus a couple of specialized outside instructors) and all of the remaining instructional personnel, coaches, etc.

For students taught, the distribution is as follows:

	<i>Students</i>	<i>% of Total for Year</i>
TA's	1,393	45%
Others	1,718	55%

For courses taught, the distribution is as follows:

	<i>Courses</i>	<i>% of Total for Year</i>
TA's, etc.	76	46%
Others	89	54%

Salaries paid:

TA's	11%
Others (including PE administration, School of Education courses)	89%

Appendix 8

Summary of Student-Athlete Questionnaire
(collected by Charles A. Taylor)

Sample: 313 varsity athletes of various sports—1968–69

Financial Aid:

171 recruited; 112 not recruited.

125 receiving financial aid from Athletic Department; 81 receiving academic aid.

253 work to help finance their education, 1/3 in Dept. of Athletics.

Jobs considered average in difficulty and comparable to other campus jobs.

41 consider their financial aid as payment for their participation; 81 do not.

105 consider their financial aid as a form of scholarship to assist their education; 19 do not.

Sample is equally divided as to whether or not men receiving financial aid got more consideration from coaches.

Academic:

Cumulative grade point average at present:

Below 2.0	11
2.0 –2.24	44
2.25–2.49	37
2.5 –2.99	115
3.0 –4.0	89

Time spent per week in sport during season:

10–14 hrs	65
15–18	108
19–22	78
23–26	25
27 plus	11

191 feel that time spent detracts from their academic pursuits; 130 do not feel this way.

176 feel their grades suffer because of athletic participation: 23 ... a lot; 126 ... a little; 32 ... very little

41 are in favor of spending less time practicing; 212 feel time in practice okay.

Enjoyment:

307 enjoy their athletic participation; 6 do not.

289 feel that participation in competitive sports gives benefits (other than financial aid) that otherwise would not be available at Stanford. 21 do not feel this way.

Instruction:

Rating of quality of coaching in relation to quality of instruction in academic subjects:

Outstanding	110
Above average	119
Average	63
Below average	16
Very poor	44

Amount of personal instruction compared to that in academic subjects:

Substantially more	131
More	90
Same	60
Less	14

Social acceptance:

243 feel they are accepted by student peers on the same basis as other students; 81 do not feel this way.

Note: Football players . . . 48 felt accepted, 47 did not.

178 feel accepted by their academic instructors on same basis as other students; 28 do not.

Note: Football . . . 63 felt accepted equally, 10 did not.

Level of Competition:

Ratings of strength of tests in competition with Stanford:

	All Sports	Football
Too strong	17	1
About right	156	71
Too weak	29	1

Preference for competing against teams with *less* strength than those of AAWU Conference

	All Sports	Football
Yes	9	1
No	292	72

Preference for "out of season" practice:

	All Sports	Football
Yes	180	68
No	66	25

If no "out of season" practice, time would be spent:

Academic endeavors	145
Other physical activities	134
Work out in sport of my interest	186

Appendix 9

Statement by Council of Athletes

At a time when the effects of intercollegiate athletic participation are in question, the members of the Stanford Council of Athletes feel it is necessary that the opinion of the athletes be stated. The Council of Athletes, acting as a representative body, has drawn up the following statement with the purpose of expressing this opinion. The point in question is: what effect does intercollegiate athletics have on the education of the Stanford student-athlete?

The education of the athlete is affected in two important ways. First, for the majority of athletes, intercollegiate participation means a limiting of other extracurricular activities. Second, the athlete must quite often compromise his response to academic pressure in order to meet the pressures of athletics. Yet, these two effects and any other possible effects are more than compensated for by the understanding the athlete obtains of both himself and his fellow participants. This understanding, however, is not reached at the cost of the athlete placing athletics above academics.

Like any other extracurricular activity, intercollegiate participation places a demand on the time and attention of the participant. This demand does affect the amount of time and attention devoted to academics, but the time actually taken from studying is very small. For the athlete, this demand for time and attention is usually met with a limiting of other extracurricular activities. These other activities could possibly broaden the athlete's interests and further his education at Stanford, but the athlete in making a choice has decided that intercollegiate athletics has more to offer.

In addition to the direct demands for time and attention, the athlete is expected to respond to the pressures of high intensity competition. The degree of this pressure is uncommon to most other extracurricular activities and it puts the athlete in the position of having to respond to two simultaneous pressures, academics and athletics. The athlete's response to these combined pressures is not always the same. For a few athletes, the additional pressure of athletics forces the athlete to respond to academic pressures with an increased intensity and effort. However, for the majority of athletes, the response is one of compromise. The athlete compromises his time, his energy, and his concern for academics in order to respond to the pressures of athletics. This compromise, however, does not mean that the athlete has placed athletics above academics. Intercollegiate participation at Stanford does not demand and does not receive a priority above academics. If the Stanford athlete felt athletics was more important than academics, he would have chosen another school.

The pressure on the athlete to perform well on the athletic field is the same pressure on the student in the classroom. This pressure common to both environments is the student athlete's own inner drive, his self-imposed pressure. The coach or the teacher may produce an exterior pressure but it is the athlete's self-imposed pressure that will determine his response.

There is a third possible effect which athletics might have on the athlete's education and this is segregation. The athlete, if truly set off from the rest of the student body, would fail to realize all the educational opportunities open to him. Also, being in this alienated position would narrow the athlete's viewpoint and interests. But the athlete does not associate and live with other athletes because they are athletes. He chooses his friends and associates on the basis of individual characteristics, and athletic ability is only one of many characteristics. The athlete does not live and associate with other athletes because he is more comfortable doing so, and he does not live and associate with them because teammates expect it of him.

In exchange for the athlete's time, energy, and response to pressure, the athlete receives a better understanding of both himself and his fellow athletes. High competition athletics provides the athlete with an environment of intensity within which he is able to observe his response and the response of others under intense conditions. Not only is the athlete able to observe his response, but he is also able to improve his response to pressure and intense situations by constantly conditioning under it. The high intensity created by the pressure and the level of intercollegiate athletics, forces the athlete to forget any self-doubts or false impressions of himself. It forces the athlete to spontaneously perform to the highest of his capabilities.

Athletics also teaches the athlete the strong dependence he has on others. An athlete, no matter how great he may be, must eventually accept the fact that the success of his efforts depends a great deal on the efforts of others, and the success of the team depends in part on him. The athlete not only learns

this strong interdependence in life, but also learns a high degree of self-dependence. By constantly responding to pressure with an inner drive, the athlete learns to place a reliance on his own capabilities.

There are many other ways in which intercollegiate athletics develops the athlete, but few athletes participate for the personal development they receive. They participate for a number of reasons which are sometimes difficult to define.

For some athletes, the coordinated use of body and mind provides the primary motivation. For others, the completely physical and spontaneous environment of the athletic field offers a temporary break from the grind of the classroom and studying. There are some athletes who participate primarily because they are on scholarship. However, being an athletic scholarship recipient does not necessarily mean this is the athlete's prime motivation.

Some athletes, during moments of competitive performance, are able to rise above what they are, above what they can and cannot do. The athlete at this moment is independent of his physical capabilities. The feeling associated with this moment and the desire to attain that moment can also motivate an athlete to participation. This same feeling is possible even in intramural sports, but the intensity of the intercollegiate competition makes the feeling even more possible.

The challenge associated with highly competitive athletics provides another motivation for some athletes. For the athlete, as the challenge becomes greater, his effort becomes greater and the reward of overcoming the challenge becomes more meaningful. There are many reasons why an athlete chooses intercollegiate participation. To some degree, an athlete participates for all of these reasons, but there is one motivation which is truly common to all participants; the desire to do something well and the feeling of self-satisfaction in doing it. An athlete can receive no greater reward than the feeling of self-satisfaction when, under intense competition, the athlete makes a good block, wins a 100-yard dash, or truly responds to any test of his capabilities.

In conclusion, intercollegiate athletics definitely does have an effect on the education of the athlete, but this effect is not completely detrimental to his education. A primary objective of education is to give the student a better understanding of himself and others. The intensity of intercollegiate participation gives the student athlete a part of this understanding, more so than any other extra-curricular activity or academic class. The athlete's decision to participate does not always seem rational. He does not balance the personal development he receives against the detrimental effects to his education. Yet this balance does exist, and the athlete himself does make the final choice to participate.

Respectfully submitted,

Bob Bittner, *Director*
Council of Athletics

Appendix 10 Statistics and Attitudes
on Recruited Conference Athletes

ITEM: High School Grade Point Average

		<i>Under 2.00</i>	<i>2.01-2.49</i>	<i>2.50-2.99</i>	<i>3.00-3.49</i>	<i>3.50-4.00</i>	<i>TOTALS</i>
Washington	Number	0	2	17	17	3	39
	Percentage	0.0	5.1	43.5	43.5	7.6	100
Washington State	Number	0	0	26	16	2	44
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	59.0	36.3	4.5	100
Oregon	Number	0	2	18	13	4	37
	Percentage	0.0	5.4	48.6	35.1	10.8	100
Oregon State	Number	0	5	17	9	4	35
	Percentage	0.0	14.2	48.5	25.7	11.4	100
California	Number	0	0	5	9	6	20
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	25.0	45.0	30.0	100
Stanford	Number	0	0	3	17	26	46
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	6.5	36.9	56.5	100
UCLA	Number	0	0	3	13	3	19
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	15.7	68.4	15.7	100
USC	Number	0	2	21	7	2	32
	Percentage	0.0	6.7	65.6	21.8	6.7	100
Totals	Number	0	11	110	101	50	272
	Percentage	0.0	4.0	40.4	37.1	18.3	100

Comments: 93.4% of Stanford's group had a high school G.P.A. of 3.0 or over. 72.3% of USC's group had a high school G.P.A. of 2.99 and under. Stanford and USC represented the extremes both over and under 3.0.

ITEM: Of The Three Most Important Factors Chosen (Geographical, Institutional, and Individual), Which Is The Most Important?

		<i>Geographical</i>	<i>Institutional</i>	<i>Individual</i>	<i>TOTALS</i>
Washington	Number	6	21	12	39
	Percentage	15.3	53.8	30.7	100
Washington State	Number	5	12	26	43
	Percentage	11.6	27.9	60.4	100
Oregon	Number	9	11	17	37
	Percentage	24.3	29.7	45.9	100
Oregon State	Number	2	13	20	35
	Percentage	5.7	37.1	57.1	100
California	Number	0	12	8	20
	Percentage	0.0	60.0	40.0	100
Stanford	Number	2	29	16	47
	Percentage	4.2	61.7	34.0	100
UCLA	Number	1	10	8	19
	Percentage	5.2	52.6	42.1	100
USC	Number	5	19	8	32
	Percentage	15.6	59.3	25.0	100
Totals	Number	30	127	115	272
	Percentage	11.0	46.6	42.2	100

Comments: Institution and individual influences were of more importance than geographical influences. Oregon cited, at the 24.3% level, the highest percentage influenced by geographical factors. Five schools, Stanford (61.7%), California (60.0%), USC (59.3%), Washington (53.8%), and UCLA (52.6%) indicated the institutional influences to be most important. Individual influences were most important at Washington State (60.4), Oregon State (57.1) and Oregon (45.9).

ITEM: Most Important Institutional Factor

		*	*	*	*	**	**	**	**	
		<i>Friendly and Sociable Students</i>	<i>Beautiful Campus</i>	<i>Athletic Reputation</i>	<i>Not Too Big</i>	<i>Fine Facilities</i>	<i>Outstanding Faculty</i>	<i>Strong in My Major</i>	<i>Academically Prestigious</i>	<i>TOTALS</i>
Washington	Number	1	4	16	0	1	1	5	11	39
	Percentage	2.5	10.2	41.0	0.0	2.5	2.5	13.5	28.2	100
Washington State	Number	13	1	6	10	1	0	8	3	42
	Percentage	30.9	2.3	14.2	23.8	2.3	0.0	19.0	7.1	100
Oregon	Number	3	4	9	1	2	1	16	1	37
	Percentage	8.1	10.8	24.3	2.7	5.4	2.7	43.2	2.7	100
Oregon State	Number	4	0	21	1	2	0	5	2	35
	Percentage	11.4	0.0	60.0	2.8	5.7	0.0	14.2	5.7	100
California	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	9	10	20
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	45.0	50.0	100
Stanford	Number	2	1	0	1	3	1	3	36	47
	Percentage	4.2	2.1	0.0	2.1	6.3	2.1	6.3	76.5	100
UCLA	Number	0	0	14	0	1	0	1	3	19
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	73.6	0.0	5.2	0.0	5.2	15.7	100
USC	Number	0	0	13	2	1	0	8	8	32
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	40.6	6.2	3.1	0.0	25.0	25.0	100
Totals	Number	23	10	79	15	12	3	55	74	271
	Percentage	8.4	3.6	29.1	5.5	4.4	1.1	20.2	27.3	100

Comments: * Identified as non-academic institutional factors.

** Identified as academic institutional factors.

95% of the California recruits indicated academic factors as the most important of the institutional factors. 73.6% of the UCLA recruits felt the most important factor to be athletic reputation. 30.9% of the Washington State group cited the friendly and sociable students.

ITEM: Of The Most Important Institutional Factors What Portion Was Non-Academic And Academic Influences

		<i>Non-Academic</i>	<i>Academic</i>	<i>TOTALS</i>
Washington	Number	21	18	39
	Percentage	53.8	46.1	100
Washington State	Number	30	12	42
	Percentage	71.4	28.5	100
Oregon	Number	17	20	37
	Percentage	45.9	54.0	100
Oregon State	Number	26	9	35
	Percentage	74.2	25.7	100
California	Number	0	20	20
	Percentage	0.0	100.0	100
Stanford	Number	4	43	47
	Percentage	8.5	91.4	100
UCLA	Number	14	5	19
	Percentage	73.6	26.3	100
USC	Number	15	17	32
	Percentage	46.8	53.1	100
Totals	Number	127	144	271
	Percentage	46.8	53.1	100

Comments: California and Stanford had the highest percentage of academic factors as part of their decision to attend. California was 100% and Stanford 91.4%, Oregon State at 74.2% and UCLA at 73.6% were the top in citing non-academic factors as most important.

ITEM: The Function Of A University Is -

		<i>For Research</i>	<i>For Vocational Training</i>	<i>For Academic and Social Training</i>	<i>TOTALS</i>
Washington	Number	13	13	13	39
	Percentage	33.3	33.3	33.3	100
Washington State	Number	10	13	20	43
	Percentage	23.2	30.2	46.5	100
Oregon	Number	8	13	16	37
	Percentage	21.6	35.1	43.2	100
Oregon State	Number	7	16	12	35
	Percentage	20.0	45.7	34.2	100
California	Number	4	11	5	20
	Percentage	20.0	55.0	25.0	100
Stanford	Number	9	8	29	46
	Percentage	19.5	17.3	63.0	100
UCLA	Number	2	11	6	19
	Percentage	10.5	57.8	31.5	100
USC	Number	7	18	7	32
	Percentage	21.8	56.2	21.8	100
Totals	Number	60	103	108	271
	Percentage	22.1	38.0	39.8	100

ITEM: I Expect The Following From My College Experience

		<i>Training in My Vocation</i>	<i>A Diploma and a Good Time</i>	<i>Athletic Fame</i>	<i>A Good Job and the Good Life</i>	<i>General Education Appreciation of Ideas</i>	<i>Basis for Graduate Education</i>	<i>TOTALS</i>
	Number	5	0	0	25	4	5	39
Washington	Percentage	12.8	0.0	0.0	64.1	10.2	12.8	100
	Number	7	1	0	25	5	5	43
Washington	Percentage	16.2	2.3	0.0	58.1	11.6	11.6	100
State	Number	3	3	2	16	5	8	37
Oregon	Percentage	8.1	8.1	5.4	43.2	13.5	21.6	100
	Number	5	1	3	18	2	6	35
Oregon	Percentage	14.2	2.8	8.5	51.4	5.7	17.1	100
State	Number	2	1	0	7	4	6	20
California	Percentage	10.0	5.0	0.0	35.0	20.0	30.0	100
	Number	3	1	2	10	18	13	47
Stanford	Percentage	6.3	2.1	4.2	21.2	38.2	27.6	100
	Number	2	0	0	13	1	3	19
UCLA	Percentage	10.5	0.0	0.0	68.4	5.2	15.7	100
	Number	9	1	0	14	1	7	32
USC	Percentage	28.1	3.1	0.0	43.7	3.1	21.8	100
	Number	36	8	7	128	40	53	272
Totals	Percentage	13.2	2.9	2.5	47.0	14.7	19.4	100

Comments: 47.0% of conference recruits saw college as a means to the good job and the good life. UCLA had the highest percentage for the good job and the good life (68.4%).

ITEM: This University Is Best Known For The Following

		<i>Friendly Campus and Students</i>	<i>Beautiful Campus</i>	<i>Athletic Fame</i>	<i>Social Activities</i>	<i>Practical Mindedness</i>	<i>Intellectual Atmosphere</i>	<i>TOTALS</i>
Washington	Number	1	10	19	1	1	7	39
	Percentage	2.5	25.6	47.9	2.5	2.5	17.8	100
Washington State	Number	27	3	2	1	5	4	42
	Percentage	64.2	7.1	4.7	2.3	11.9	9.5	100
Oregon	Number	6	9	0	21	0	1	37
	Percentage	16.2	24.3	0.0	56.7	0.0	2.7	100
Oregon State	Number	20	1	9	0	5	0	35
	Percentage	57.1	2.8	25.7	0.0	14.2	0.0	100
California	Number	0	0	0	1	0	19	20
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	95.0	100
Stanford	Number	0	0	0	0	0	45	45
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	100
UCLA	Number	0	0	14	1	0	3	18
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	73.6	5.2	0.0	15.7	100
USC	Number	0	0	31	0	0	1	32
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	96.8	0.0	0.0	3.1	100
Totals	Number	54	23	75	25	11	80	268
	Percentage	20.1	8.5	27.9	9.3	4.1	29.8	100

Comments: Washington State (64.2%) and Oregon State (57.1%) cited friendly campus and students. Athletic fame was most descriptive of USC (96.8%), UCLA (73.6%) and Washington (47.9%). Oregon cited social activities (56.7%). Stanford (100%) and California (95.0%) cited intellectual atmosphere as the best description. As a group the Pacific-8 Conference cited intellectual and athletic images as most descriptive.

ITEM: What University Does This Statement Best Fit, "Most Consistent Football Power In West"?

		Washington	Washington State	Oregon	Oregon State	California	Stanford	UCLA	USC	Don't Know	TOTALS
Washington	Number	2	0	1	0	0	1	14	19	2	39
	Percentage	5.1	0.0	2.5	0.0	0.0	2.5	35.8	48.7	5.2	100
Washington State	Number	2	0	1	3	1	0	13	22	2	44
	Percentage	4.5	0.0	2.2	6.8	2.2	0.0	29.5	50.0	4.5	100
Oregon	Number	5	0	1	0	0	0	9	21	1	37
	Percentage	13.5	0.0	2.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	24.3	56.7	2.7	100
Oregon State	Number	2	0	0	1	0	0	13	19	0	35
	Percentage	5.7	0.0	0.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	37.1	54.2	0.0	100
California	Number	0	0	0	0	1	0	6	13	0	20
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	30.0	65.0	0.0	100
Stanford	Number	2	0	0	2	0	0	7	34	2	47
	Percentage	4.2	0.0	0.0	4.2	0.0	0.0	14.8	72.3	4.2	100
UCLA	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	1	19
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	52.6	42.1	5.2	100
USC	Number	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	31	0	32
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3.1	96.8	0.0	100
Totals	Number	13	0	3	6	2	1	73	167	8	273
	Percentage	4.7	0.0	1.0	2.1	0.7	0.3	26.7	61.1	2.9	100

Comments: USC at 61.1% and UCLA at 26.7% are the two tabbed best in West in football. The L.A. area schools make up 87.8% of the group. Washington was a distant third with 4.7%.

ITEM: What University Does This Statement Best Fit, "Among The Academic Elite"?

		Washington	Washington State	Oregon	Oregon State	California	Stanford	UCLA	USC	Don't Know	TOTALS
Washington	Number	5	0	1	0	5	21	2	0	5	39
	Percentage	12.8	0.0	2.5	0.0	12.8	53.8	5.1	0.0	12.8	100
Washington State	Number	0	2	0	1	0	30	5	1	5	44
	Percentage	0.0	4.5	0.0	2.2	0.0	68.1	11.3	2.2	11.3	100
Oregon	Number	0	0	0	0	7	28	0	1	1	37
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	18.9	75.6	0.0	2.7	2.7	100
Oregon State	Number	0	0	0	1	8	18	2	1	5	35
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.8	22.8	51.4	5.7	2.8	14.2	100
California	Number	0	0	1	0	19	0	0	0	0	20
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	5.0	0.0	95.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100
Stanford	Number	0	0	0	0	1	45	0	0	1	47
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2.1	95.7	0.0	0.0	2.1	100
UCLA	Number	0	0	0	0	3	13	3	0	0	19
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	15.7	68.4	15.7	0.0	0.0	100
USC	Number	0	0	0	0	11	14	4	2	1	32
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	34.3	43.7	12.5	6.2	3.1	100
Totals	Number	5	2	2	2	54	169	16	5	18	273
	Percentage	1.8	0.7	0.7	0.7	19.7	61.9	5.8	1.8	6.5	100

Comments: Stanford with 61.9% was far and away identified as the choice for academic elite. California was next with 19.7%. The two Bay Area schools make up 81.6% of the group.

ITEM: What University Does This Statement Best Fit, "Ivy League School Of The West"?

		Washington	Washington State	Oregon	Oregon State	California	Stanford	UCLA	USC	Don't Know	TOTALS
Washington	Number	2	0	1	0	0	25	2	2	6	38
	Percentage	5.2	0.0	2.6	0.0	0.0	65.7	5.2	5.2	15.7	100
Washington State	Number	2	2	0	0	0	20	5	3	12	44
	Percentage	4.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	45.4	11.3	6.8	27.2	100
Oregon	Number	0	0	2	0	3	21	0	4	7	37
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	5.4	0.0	8.1	56.7	0.0	10.8	18.9	100
Oregon State	Number	0	0	4	0	0	18	8	0	5	35
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	11.4	0.0	0.0	51.4	22.8	0.0	14.2	100
California	Number	0	0	0	0	4	7	2	2	5	20
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	35.0	10.0	10.0	25.0	100
Stanford	Number	0	0	0	0	0	46	0	1	0	47
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	97.8	0.0	2.1	0.0	100
UCLA	Number	0	0	0	0	0	11	1	1	6	19
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	57.8	5.2	5.2	31.5	100
USC	Number	0	0	0	0	0	22	1	4	5	32
	Percentage	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	68.7	3.1	12.5	15.6	100
Totals	Number	4	2	7	0	7	170	19	17	46	272
	Percentage	1.4	0.7	2.5	0.0	2.5	62.5	6.9	6.2	16.9	100

Comments: By almost the same percentage for Stanford as "Academic Elite" (61.9%), Stanford was labeled the "Ivy League School of the West." (62.5%)